A DEFENCE OF THE Ordinations and Miniſtry OF THE CHURCH of *ENGLAND.*

Imprimatur

Hic Liber cui Titulus (*A Defence of the Ordinations*, &c.)

Jo. Battely R^mo Pri ac D^no D^no Wilhelmo Archiep. Cantuar. a Sacris Domesticis.

Jan. 12. 1687.

By Mr Whitfield, F of K C Cam-

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

Ordinations and Miniſtry

OF THE

CHURCH of *ENGLAND.*

In Anſwer to the Scandals raiſed or revived againſt them, in ſeveral late Pamphlets, and particularly in one Intituled,

The Church of England *Truly Repreſented,* &c.

Τολμηταὶ, αὐθάδεις, δόξας δ' τρέμυσι βλασφημοῦντες,
2 *Pet.* 2. 10.

LONDON,

Printed for *Brabazon Aylmer,* at the *Three Pidgeons* over againſt the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhil,*
M DC LXXX VIII.

Price Nine Pence.

DEHENOCH

TO THE
READER.

THIS *Defence was written ſome while ſince, and had been ſooner made publick, but that it ſeemed to be, in a great meaſure, prevented by Two other Treatiſes ſet forth on the ſame Subject, the one in* Latin, *printed at* Cambridge, *and conſiſting of two Diſcourſes preached in that Univerſity; the other in* Engliſh, *printed at* London, *and Entitled,* A ſhort Defence of the Orders of the Church of *England,* as by Law eſtabliſhed. *The latter of theſe Treatiſes concerns it ſelf only with the Form of our Ordinations, and anſwers thoſe Objections which have been raiſed, and inſiſted on by our Adverſaries, about ſome little Change or Variation which has been made in it, but the former indeed goes through with the whole Controverſie, and leaves nothing unſaid which is neceſſary or material on this Subject; and if the learned Author had thought fit to publiſh it in the* Engliſh, *as well as in the* Latin *Tongue, that ſo it might have come into the hands, and prevented the miſtakes of thoſe illiterate Perſons, whom our Adverſaries do chiefly deſign to ſeduce and impoſe on by their falſe Accompts of theſe things, it would have effectually ſecured this Point, and there would have been no need of any thing to be added by any ſecond hand, but this*

not being done, nor intended, as I can learn, and our Adversaries still urging their Point, and improving this kind of Calumnies among the Vulgar, as if no direct answer had, either heretofore, or of late, been returned to them: It was therefore thought advisable, that this defence also, (which relates to the whole Contest, and takes in both the old and new Objections which have been raised on this Head) should at length see the light, and that for these two Reasons especially.

First, *Because there has not in those two former Treatises been any notice taken of that Scurrilous Pamphlet to which this is a Reply; and if it should go thus unanswered, it would be matter of Triumph to our Adversaries, who are very apt to boast themselves on such occasions as this, and to make it an Argument, among their Party, of the great strength of their Cause, if they can but say, That a Discourse was never answered, though perhaps, it was, like this, so loosely and so scandalously written, as not to deserve an Answer; I say, to take away this little ground of Triumph or insulting from our Adversaries: It was held convenient that these Papers should be published, and that their frivolous Cavils, and impudent falshoods should be confronted, and, if possible, shamed out of the World, by the more substantial force of Truth and Reason. And,*

Secondly, *The other reason for the publishing these Papers, was, that in them the great Point of the first planting of Christianity in this Nation, and of the most early Successions of Bishops in this Church is at large discuss'd, and both these are proved, from the most exact and authentick Histories now extant, to be derived from other Fountains, and to owe their beginnings to other hands, than those of St.* Peter, *or the first Bishops of*

the

the Roman See: And if this be so, that Church does, by this means, lose the most plausible Plea she had to that Empire or Jurisdiction which she pretends to over us; for if this be not founded in any words of Scripture, or any expres's grant of our Saviour, as has been so often and so fully proved by others, then the next pretence they can have for it must be, this of the founding or propagating other particular Churches: And if, as to us, they are beaten from this hold also, there cannot be any solid Foundation left, on which they may build this Empire, but it must be acknowledged for a meer Encroachment or Usurpation: It being then sufficiently made out in this Defence, that neither our Christianity nor our Episcopacy are derived from Rome, *this Prop of their Cause is hereby taken away, unless they can disprove the Authorities which are here offered, or produce some better in their room.* See Dr. Barrow's Popes Supremacy.

And these were the main Inducements for the adding this Defence to what has come forth already touching this matter. And it is freely owned, that there is nothing in it, which is wholly new, nothing which has not been long since urged, and maintained by those of our Church, who have heretofore laboured in this Field, viz. Usher, Mason, Bramhall, *and the like, whose Authorities are here frequently referred to and made use of, so that in truth this and what else of this kind, has come forth of late, might very well have been spared, had not that restless Spirit of Contention, with which our Adversaries are possessed, prompted them, not only to invent new, but also to repeat old Calumnies against us, to look back to the very birth or beginning of our Reformation, and to set this out to the Vulgar, with all the falsest Colours and foulest Representations they could think of. Now since these men have taken upon them this odious Task of reviving*

viving these old and obsolete Scandals, on purpose that they may delude and put a cheat upon the World, this makes it necessary for us to submit to the burthen of repeating those Answers or Confutations which have been given to them, that so we may serve the Truth, and give a right account of things. All then that we have to desire of such as are not vers'd in these matters, is, that they would, upon the first venting of this kind of Libels, suspend their belief of these Stories for a while, till they meet with the Answers to them, which will not long be wanting; and when they have both the Libels and the Answers together, that they will compare them throughly, and judge impartially on which side the Truth does lye; and if they will but use this method, we make no doubt, but it will easily appear, both in this and all other Points in contest, which is the fair, and which the designing Party, who are the True, and who the False Representers.

ERRATA.

PAge 7. line 25. for *wholy* read *whole*. p. 13. l. 26. for *allo* r. *also*. p. 25. l. 33. blot out *Secondly*. p. 41. l. 23. for *more* r. *none*. l. 87. l. 24. blot out *Thirdly*.

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

Ordinations and Miniſtry

OF THE

CHURCH of *ENGLAND.*

THE buſineſs of repreſenting, as it relates, to the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, having been driven to a point, and (as is owned by one of the Writers on that ſide) carried as far as it will go; (that is, the things themſelves, which that Church hath been charged with, being proved from the Decrees of her Councils, and the Teſtimonies of her moſt approved Authors truly to belong to her, and being alſo ſhewn to be in their own Nature ſuch, as all the new invented Varniſhes, and moſt favourable Expoſitions cannot hinder from appearing ſcandalous and inconſiſtent with the Purity of the Chriſtian Religion.) The Defenders of that cauſe finding very little encouragement from the Merits of their cauſe to maintain

Amicable Accommodation.

tain the Diſpute any longer in that Method, have thought it their wiſeſt courſe to alter their Meaſures, and inſtead of defending their own Church, to make ſome attack upon ours, hoping that this carrying the War into their Enemies Country, will be a means of diverting it from their own Doors, and that they may be more ſucceſsful in laying waſt what is more ſtrongly and ſubſtantially built abroad, then in maintaining what they find ſo ruinous and decayed at home.

With this deſign they have ſometime ſince ſet forth a Pamphlet which ſtiles it ſelf, *The Church of* England *truly Repreſented*, and you may well ſuppoſe that it is ſo, when it is done by their impartial hands; but leaſt you ſhould make any ſcruple of this, the Title adds, *According to Dr.* Heylin's *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, And you cannot doubt but that this is very Authentick. If you ſhould, you Page 3. would not only reflect upon *the Church of* Englands *beſt and moſt beloved Hiſtorian*; but would alſo call in queſtion the judgment of thoſe who recommended it to the reading of her Royal Highneſs the late Dutcheſs of *York*, for the ſettling her in the Proteſtant Religion; nay her own judgment too, who was pleaſed to declare *that the reading* Page 4. *of this Hiſtory was a main ground or occaſion of her forſaking the Church of* England, *and going over to that of* Rome.

Upon ſome hints taken from this Hiſtorian, this Author pretends truly to repreſent our Church, and in his very firſt Paragraph he rakes together out of him three very ſound and ſubſtantial Principles, upon which he perſwades us that this Church was at firſt reared, *viz.* *The luſtful and violent Deſires of King* Henry

Henry *the Eighth. The Acts of Spoil and Rapine, even to an high degree of Sacriledge, committed in the immature years of King* Edward *the Sixth. And the hopes of making good her Legitimation in Queen* Elizabeth. By theſe ſteps he tells us, *The* Ignis fatuus *of Reformation grew up to a Comet, and this Comet having been in exile for a while, found its way home again, being uſhered back into the Land by that great Luminary Dr.* Heylin. Thus does this accompliſht Author give us in his firſt Sentence a taſt of his Hiſtory, Philoſophy, Oratory and Courtſhip.

But this high ſtrain at firſt makes him forget himſelf a little in what follows; for theſe his three Principles of the Reformation are, immediately after, reduced to one, namely, *That of Queen* Elizabeths *Legitimation not conſiſting with the Popes Supremacy:* For it ſeems, if this matter could have been adjuſted, *This* Ignis fatuus, *though it were in King* Edward's *days grown to the Prodigy of a Comet, had been extinguiſht in the Lake of* Geneva; *and ſo the Church of* England *had never been ſeen nor heard of in the World.* Page 2

Now if this be a true account of the Riſe of the Church of *England: If the Reformation is to bear date from the firſt year of Queen* Elizabeth, *as* Rome *did formerly Ad urbe condita*; then why does he father it upon the luſtful Deſires of King *Henry* the Eighth, or the love of Sacriledge in the days of King *Edward?* Why muſt it ſtand charged with thoſe Crimes and Miſcarriages which were tranſacted before it had any being or appearance in the World? This is very hard dealing, not to allow it an earlier birth than the firſt of Queen *Elizabeth*, and yet to load it with all the Scandals and Blemiſhes of two foregoing Page 3

Reigns. But if this Author proves at laſt to be out in his Computation, and the Church of *England* (as it is reformed and diſtinguiſhed from that of *Rome*) had in truth a being, if not in the Reign of *Henry* the Eighth, yet at leaſt in that of *Edward* the Sixth, (when not only another Supremacy was owned, but alſo another Liturgy was eſtabliſhed) then 'tis plain, that neither the Birth, nor the being of this Church did depend upon Queen *Elizabeths* Legitimation: for as it had a being before this came into queſtion, ſo it might ſtill have continued that being, *Though the Pope had then abated ſomething of his accuſtomed rigour, and had not laid claim to the Realm of* England, *as being held in Fee of the Apoſtolick See*: For if he had complied in this matter, *and had made void the Declarations of two of his Predeceſſors*, (a thing not ſo ſtrange and unheard of in that See, when it will turn to a good account to them.) It doth not directly follow from hence, that the Queen would in exchange have acknowledged his Supremacy, or would, in all points, have embraced the Faith which that Church profeſſes: It doth not appear that there were any ſuch terms propounded on the Queens part, nor does Dr. *Heylin* affirm that ſhe would have conſented to any ſuch contract; but all the Advances ſhe made towards an Agreement with the Pope were, that *at her coming to the Crown, ſhe wrote to her Reſident at* Rome, (*as ſhe did to her other Ambaſſadors*) *to renew his Powers, and to bid him acquaint the Pope with her Succeſſion*; which being no more than an uſual Ceremony in the like caſes, does not imply that ſhe was at all concerned, whether he declared for her Legitimation or not, much leſs that ſhe would purchaſe his favour herein at ſo dear

Page 2.

Burnt Hiſt. Reform part 2. p. 374.

dear a rate, as that of quitting her Supremacy, and complying with all the Errours and Corruptions of that Religion. We have great reaſon to believe the contrary, both from that true greatneſs of Soul which was apparent in all her other actions, and alſo from thoſe early impreſſions of the truth, which, in her firſt years, ſhe had received from the chief Actors or Inſtruments in the Reformation.

Now, if ſhe would have inſiſted on theſe points, (as 'tis moſt probable ſhe would, if there had been a ſolemn Treaty about theſe Matters) then there would indeed a breach have followed between her and *Rome*, but ſurely the Reformation would not have been loſt, *nor would the Church of* England *have* Page 2. *been ſwallowed up in the Lake of* Geneva (as this Author vainly imagins) but it would ſtill have flouriſhed, as it has ſince done under that Pious and Glorious Patroneſs; but then indeed this Gentleman would have loſt a fine ſaying, *viz. That the Church of* England *was Midwiv'd into the World by a Maiden Queen, to make good her Legitimation.*

It is not my purpoſe to follow this Libeller through all the Scandals which he indeavours to throw upon the *Engliſh* Reformation, and upon thoſe Princes that have been favourers of it, only I cannot but obſerve theſe two things upon this new method of managing the Controverſie.

Firſt, That it is not only uncharitable in it ſelf, in that it aſcribes all the ſteps that were made in ſo ſerious and important a Work, as the change of Religion, to ſuch baſe and inferiour ends, as any Chriſtian,

Christian, of the meanest Rank, would be ashamed to own, and think it a great affront to be charged with; but it is also, in this case, highly reflecting upon, and injurious to, the Memories of Sovereign Princes, it supposes them to have made Religion only a pretence, and that in all their Councils and Debates concerning it, their aim was only at their worldly Interests, and, whatever colours they might put upon the business, the searching out and advancing of the Truth, was the very least and the lowest thing in their Intentions.

Now I would fain know whether this be not to give a very fair and honourable Character of these Persons, whether it be not in effect to say that they had no real sense of Religion, nor acted upon any sound or honourable Principles, even in those things which seemed most of all to require them. And how much does this come short of calling them downright Atheists? And is this a way to express that reverence which is due to Crown'd Heads? Is this such a Treatment as is suitable to, either the Persons, or the Memories of Princes? If such things as these, which may be here and there scattered in Histories, and mentioned as the Remarks of some over-curious and ill affected Persons, must be heapt together, and made the Standard by which we must take our Measures of the Actions and Designs of those who have lived before us, what Princes Memory will bear this Test? Whose actions will be delivered down clear and untouch'd to Posterity? Will not even *Constantine* himself, the first Christian Emperour, be forced to lye under this blot, and be reputed to have changed Heathenism for Christianity, only that he might thereby advance his Secular ends? This way

Vide *Zosimi* Histor.

way of Writing then, which surmizes the worst things that can be of Princes, and gives these as the grounds of their actions, especially in matters of Religion, must needs argue that there is in the Writers a great want both of common Charity towards them as they were Christians, and of that peculiar reverence and regard which are due to their Sacred Memories, as they were Princes. But besides the undecency and irreverence which this Author is guilty of in this respect, I observe,

Secondly, That there is a peculiar Artifice or Contrivance in this Method, such as is very proper and requisite for the Defence of so weak a Cause as these men maintain: for by this means those that write in its defence, have nothing more to do, but to suggest some base and unworthy Grounds for the beginning of the Reformation, and then to lay the whole stress of this Work, as to the progress and issue of it, upon this corrupt and sandy Foundation; and if they can but thus cast a mist before the eyes of the unwary Readers, and make them believe that there is something of truth and reality in these their Suggestions, they will, after this, lead them blindfold whither they will themselves, and make them swallow the wholy Story just as they are pleased to tell it them. And thus they are insensibly drawn aside from weighing the Merits of the Cause, from considering the State of Religion, and the Nature of those Doctrines and Practices, in which the Reformation was made, what things they were in which a change was effected, and how great need there was of that change, that so the Christian Worship might be restored to its ancient Purity, and be made agreeable to the rules of

of its Inſtitution; theſe are Points which they do not deſire ſhould be throughly canvaſt, and when they have been ſo, they have gotten ſo little by it, that they think it much better to wave them quite, and to try whether they can beat off others from looking too far into them, by aſcribing them to ſome wrong Cauſes, and by raiſing in Mens minds a prejudice againſt the Authors or Promoters of this change.

Thus, if they can but perſwade you to believe, that the Popes refuſing to declare Queen *Elizabeth* Legitimate, was the only Ground of her ſetting her ſelf ſo earneſtly upon the Reforming of Religion, this they think is enough to diſcredit all that followed: And you are not to conſider whether ſhe and her Clergy did well or ill in appointing the Sacrament of Chriſts Body and Blood to be Adminiſtred in both kinds, according to our Saviours own Inſtitution, in allowing the People the uſe of the Scriptures, and of the Publick Prayers in their own
1 Cor. 14. Tongue, according to St. *Paul*'s Preſcription, in not ſuffering them to adore the Croſs, or to pay any Worſhip to Images, a thing expreſly forbidden by God in the Second Commandment, in charging them not to apply themſelves to, nor to rely upon, the Interceſſion or Mediation of the Saints, there being,
1 Tim. 2. 5. as St. *Paul* aſſures us, but *one Mediator between God and men, even the Man Chriſt Jeſus*: Theſe I ſay, and the like great Points, are not at all to be examined into, nor muſt you be allowed to enquire, whether the change that was made in them, were agreeable to, or differing from, the Rules of the Goſpel; but you muſt immediately reject and condemn this change, meerly becauſe it was upheld

held and promoted by Queen *Elizabeth*, after the Pope had refuſed to allow of her Legitimation, or to declare in favour of her Title to the Crown.

Now, though it be eaſie for any conſidering Man to perceive that this is but a Trick, but a turning away the Eye to a remote and improper Object, that the Jugler may take occaſion to impoſe and put a Cheat upon your Senſes; yet this, like thoſe other Tricks, does too commonly take with the undiſcerning Multitude, and this is plainly the uſe for which it is deſigned by this Author. And indeed, this whole Pamphlet ſeems, in all the parts of it, to be calculated for the reading, and ſeaſoned to the taſt of the Rabble: For the Arguments of which it conſiſts, are ſo common and thread-bare, that thoſe who pretend to any thing of reading, muſt have met very often both with them, and their Anſwers: And the Language in which they are cloathed, is ſo courſe and Scurrilous, as makes it fitter for the Inſtruction of *Sow-gelders and Oyſter-wenches*, than of thoſe that lay claim to any ſhare of Senſe or Breeding. Page 4.

But becauſe he does, in his rude and unſeemly way, offer at ſome things, which do not only reflect upon the firſt Reformers; but do alſo ſeem to call in queſtion the whole Power or Authority of the Eſtabliſhed Church, namely, *The Succeſſion of her Miniſtry, the Validity of her Ordinations, and the Grounds of her Juriſdiction*, though, as I ſaid, all that he offers in oppoſition to theſe things, has been already more handſomely urged by ſome on their ſide, and very fully anſwered by ſome able Pens on ours: Yet ſince theſe Allegations may ſeem to ſome Per-

ſons to be both new and valid, I ſhall endeavour in the following Papers, to ſhew the weakneſs and inſufficiency of this whole charge, and to vindicate our truly Orthodox and Epiſcopal Church from the Calumnies and Reproaches of this kind, with which this her Enemy has thought fit to load her.

The Summ of his Charge againſt our Engliſh Hierarchy, may be collected out of his ſeventh Page, where it lies very confuſedly heapt together: There he tells us, That *having now truly repreſented the Church of* England, *and ſhewed her to be nothing: It neceſſarily follows that her Biſhops and Prieſts are likewiſe nothing*: His Conſequence indeed is very natural, for the Biſhops and Prieſts being included in the Church, if he has repreſented the Church out of the World, it cannot well be conceived how her Biſhops and Prieſts ſhould be left behind: But then why does he trouble himſelf any further about them? Why is he ſo weak as to buſie himſelf about nothing? Why, he is forced to own that they are not abſolutely nothing, but in ſome ſenſe only, that is, *They are nothing as to any Power or Miſſion they can pretend to*, and if they cannot make out this, they had as good be nothing at all: And therefore he gives them a being for a while, only that he may ridicule and expoſe them to the World, and when he has done this, then they muſt vaniſh too, as their Church has done before.

Well, but what is it that theſe Biſhops and Prieſts muſt have to make good their Calling? Why, he tells us, That *in a Biſhop is required not only Ordination, but alſo Spiritual Juriſdiction and Miſſion*, and whence is it that he muſt have theſe things?

Not

Not from Kings or Queens, but immediately from Christ by Succession from the Apostles, and why cannot the Bishops of our Church have these things in this way, as well as others? *Because the Church of* England *being nothing, and in Communion with no other Episcopal Church, her Bishops cannot therefore by Succession derive their Powers from the Apostles*, and if they pretend that they were once in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, and that they had this Succession and Spiritual Jurisdiction conveyed to them through the hands of that Episcopal Church, this will not serve their turn, for 'tis plain that *the Church of* Rome *never sent them to preach the Doctrine of the thirty nine Articles: So that they must either joyn with the Presbyterians in deriving their Mission extraordinarily from God by the Spirit, or else they must own that they have no Mission nor Power at all to do what they do, but from lay Authority.*

This is the heavy Charge which he draws up against our Episcopal Clergy, and by which he would prove that they are not truly such: And if we put it into order, we shall find that he intends in it to except,

First, Against their Form and Manner of Ordination: And,

Secondly, Against that Mission, or Spiritual Jurisdiction which they pretend to, as flowing from this. And his particular Exceptions to this latter are these.

Firſt, That they cannot make out their Succeſſion, nor ſhew how they derive their Miſſion from Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

Secondly, That therefore they are forced to derive their Miſſion from Kings and Queens, and to borrow their Juriſdiction from a Lay-Authority.

Thirdly, That they teach ſuch Doctrines as are different from the Church of *Rome*, and ſo cannot be ſuppoſed to be ſent by that Church, or by any that have received their Miſſion from her. Theſe being his main Exceptions, I ſhall now examine what ſtrength there is in each of them, ſo far as may ſatisfie any ordinary Enquirer: And for thoſe who have capacities and opportunities to ſearch farther into theſe Points, I ſhall refer them to thoſe Authors from whom they may receive a very clear and ample ſatisfaction. The

Firſt thing excepted againſt is, the Form or Manner of Ordination it ſelf: And for this he plainly denies that we have any ſuch as is true or valid, by ſaying, that *the Arrian and Donatiſt Biſhops were* Page 7. *true Biſhops as to Ordination; but as for our Ordination it is quite another thing.* He ſayes, *Dr.* Heylin *does pretend the like of the Biſhops of the Church of* England; but he looks upon this only as a pretence, and thinks *the Story of the Nags-head Conſecration is a much more credible buſineſs*; we ſhall ſpeak to the Story anon: In the mean time we will enquire a little whether the Forms of Ordination and Conſecration, which are eſtabliſhed in, and conſtantly uſed by our Church, do not contain all that which is eſſential

eſſential to thoſe Offices, and agreeable to the Primitive uſe and intention of them. And to take our meaſures concerning what is eſſential to theſe Rites, the ſafeſt way is to look back as far as we can, and eſpecially to ſee what light the Scripture it ſelf gives us in this matter.

Now here we may diſcover that this Sacred Rite, as it was uſed by the Apoſtles themſelves, did conſiſt of an outward bodily action, which was the laying of the Apoſtles hands on the Perſons that were to be ordained, and there was always joyned with this a Prayer or Supplication made on the behalf of thoſe on whom their hands were laid. We meet with Inſtances of this *Acts* 6. 6. & 13. 3. & 14. 23. What the particular Form or Words of this Prayer were, does not appear; but 'tis highly probable, that the words ſpoken by our Saviour to his Apoſtles, *John* 20. 23. when he gave them their Miſſion or Conſecration, were a part of this Form, and that the Apoſtles did, after his Example, either bid the Perſons ordained *receive the Holy Ghoſt*, or at leaſt pray that they might receive him, and together with him *a power to remit or retain ſins*.

And as we have theſe foot-ſteps of this Holy Rite in the Scripture it ſelf; ſo the Church of *Rome* which owns this for one of her Sacraments, and allo teaches that both the Matter and Form of the Sacraments are delivered in Scripture, muſt acknowledge this Impoſition of hands for the Matter, and theſe words of our Saviour, pronounced at the ſame time, for the Form of Ordination: for they will otherwiſe be very much put to it, to find out this Matter and Form expreſly delivered in Scripture. And therefore *Vaſquez*, one of their Oracles, ſays poſitively that *the Impoſition of hands*

is

Tom. 3. Diſp. 24. cap. 3. *is the Matter, and the words uttered with it are the Form of Orders,* and that *the Sacramental Grace is conferred in and by the Application of this Matter and Form.*

Now if this be allowed, we may appeal to that Church her ſelf to determine whether the Forms eſtabliſhed in our Church have not all that is eſſential to this Holy Action; for here, both in the Ordaining of Prieſts and conſecrating of Biſhops, beſides the examining into the Faith and Principles of the Perſons to be ordained or conſecrated, and the putting up ſeveral very proper and pertinent Prayers to God on their behalf, (both which are uſeful but not eſſential to this Rite) we have in the one the Impoſition of the Biſhops hands, and of thoſe Prieſts that are preſent, and in the other the Impoſition of the Areh-biſhops hands, and of the Biſhops that are preſent, who are always two at the leaſt, and the words pronounced at the ſame time are, *Receive or take the Holy Ghoſt,* &c. the ſame which themſelves uſe in the performing of that Action. Now this being the Form or Manner appointed and uſed in our Church for the conferring of theſe Orders, 'tis plain that thoſe who acknowledge this for a Sacrament, and look upon the Impoſition of hands, and the words uttered with it, as the Matter and Form of this Sacrament, muſt alſo own that our Ordinal has all that in it, which is eſſential to this Sacrament, and ſo to the conferring thoſe Orders which are deſigned to be given by it.

It is true there are ſome in that Church who will needs have this to be only a part, and not the entire Matter and Form of Ordination: for they tell us that this Sacrament conſiſts partly of theſe Rites, and partly of

of those other prescribed in their Pontifical, of delivering the Chalice and Paten to the Person ordained, and saying at the same time, *Receive thou Power to offer Sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses both for the Living and the Dead.* But in answer to this we say, Bishop *Bramhall* Protestants Ordina. defend. Page 994. Edit. Dublin 1676.

First, That they will be hard put to it to find any good Foundation for this part of that Sacrament in the Scripture it self; for though they cite for this St. *Luke* the 22. and refer to our Saviours Institution of the Eucharist; yet they will have much ado to prove from thence that our Saviour did deliver to each of his Apostles the Cup or Paten, or that he did intend in that Action to do any thing towards the making them Priests: besides that the words themselves spoken by our Saviour, when he bids them *take and eat of the Bread, and drink all of the Cup, and do this in remembrance of him*, have no likeness or affinity with those expressed in the Pontifical, *Receive thou Power to offer Sacrifice*, &c. So that there is no ground to conceive that this Matter or Form do, by our Saviours Institution, at all belong to, much less that they are an essential part of this Holy Rite. But,

Secondly, We answer that to make the Matter and Form of a Sacrament consist partly of one action, and partly of another, is in our Authors Phrase, *meer Nonsense*; for if the Application of the right Matter and Form does convey the Grace, and impress the Character, and this Character be an indivisible thing, and inseparably joyned with this Matter and Form, then it must be given all at once, and cannot be thus Page 13.

divided

divided into parts. Now they own that *this Character is given by the Impoſition of hands, and the words that do accompany it*; and therefore we cannot ſee how, according to their own Doctrine, there can be any uſe of, much leſs a neceſſity for, the other Matter or Form.

Barnet's Vindication of the Ordination of the Church of *England*, p. 38.

Thirdly, We obſerve that this Matter and Form, which they would have to be ſo eſſential to Prieſtly Ordination, has not been very ancient, nor of perpetual uſe in the Chriſtian Church: For in the account that their own *Morinus* gives of the ancient Rituals *, the firſt mention which he meets with of this part of the Office, is within theſe ſeven hundred years *; and he ſpeaks of no leſs than ten Rituals more ancient than this; ſome of which are ſuppoſed to be of eleven hundred years ſtanding, in which there is nothing at all ſaid of this Matter and Form; nay, 'tis evident that it was not eſtabliſhed, or preſcribed as neceſſary even in the Church of *Rome*, *till the Council of* Florence, that is, about fourteen hundred and forty, a little more than two hundred years ſince; nor is it to this day made uſe of by the Greek Church, whoſe Ordinations are yet allowed of by the *Roman*.

* *Burn.* Vind. p. 36.

* Append. p. 131.

Bram. p. 996.

Now from this we may reaſonably infer, either that this Matter and Form are not eſſential to Ordination, or if they be, that the whole Church had no compleat Ordinations for above nine hundred years, and the Greek Church have none to this very day. And let thoſe, who inſiſt ſo much upon the neceſſity of this new Matter and Form, conſider what the conſequence of this will be, and how themſelves can at this rate derive compleat Orders from Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

And

And these reasons are sufficient to shew that even the Church of *Rome* her self ought not to look upon this as a necessary or essential part of Priestly Ordination; not to say any thing of the things themselves contained in this additional Form, *viz. Of receiving Power to offer Sacrifice, and to say Masses for the Living and Dead*, which is in it self such a Power as no Christian Bishop can pretend to give, nor any Christian Priest to receive, without going back to Judaism again, and doing a manifest injury to that one perfect Sacrifice of their Saviour, which was once offered for the sins of the World.

But still it is objected by some, That as our Form of Ordination gives no power to offer Sacrifice, so neither does it give any to *consecrate the Eucharist*, which is a necessary part of the Priestly Function, and that which our Priests do in fact pretend to. As to this we answer, That we do not pretend, in their sense, *to consecrate the Eucharist*, that is, *to transubstantiate the Elements of Bread and Wine into the very natural Body and Blood of Christ*; nor do we look upon this as any part of our Priestly Office; we leave them the Glory of pretending to this Miracle, and of making themselves great by it in the eyes of those, who have the Faith to believe it in contradiction to their own senses; but in our sense of *Consecrating*, that is, of *setting apart these Elements to a Sacred use, and of making them in the name and words of our Saviour, fit Symbols or Representations of his Body and Blood, and giving them as such to those that come to receive them*; In this Sense we do pretend to *consecrate the Eucharist*, and to have a power to do so conveyed to us in our Priestly Ordination. And that,

Burn. Vind. p. 38, 39.

Firſt, Becauſe this is a neceſſary part of that Miniſtry of Reconciliation, which is committed to us as we are Prieſts, and muſt be conceived to be included in that power which is expreſly given us, *of remitting or retaining of ſins:* for this being one means ordinarily required towards the remiſſion of ſins; *this Cup being,* as our Saviour himſelf ſtiles it, *The New Teſtament in his Blood, for the remiſſion of ſins*; he that receives a power to remit ſins, muſt, together with this, receive a power to apply, or make uſe of, all thoſe means which are neceſſary to this end. And therefore if there were nothing more expreſſed in the Form of Ordination, then this power of remitting or retaining of ſins, it would follow, that they, to whom this is given, had alſo a power to conſecrate and diſtribute the Holy Euchariſt. But,

Secondly, This power is very clearly and expreſly given in the Form of Ordination, in theſe words, *Be thou a faithful diſpenſer of the word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments.* And again, at the delivering of the Bible, the words pronounced by the Biſhop are, *Take thou Authority to preach the word of God, and to Miniſter the Holy Sacraments.* Now the giving Authority to diſpenſe or Miniſter the Holy Sacraments, muſt include in it the Act of Conſecrating, as well as that of diſtributing theſe Holy Sacraments, ſince theſe words anſwer exactly to that expreſſion of St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 4. 1. where he ſtiles the Apoſtles, or Miniſters of the Goſpel, *Stewards or Diſpenſers of the Myſteries of God.* Now St. *Paul* ſtiling himſelf and the other Apoſtles by this name, 'tis plain that thoſe to whom our Church gives the ſame Title, and bids them be faithful in the diſcharge of their Office, have a like

power

power intended them hereby, in reſpect of theſe Holy Myſteries or Sacraments, with that which the Apoſtles had; and this Power cannot ſtop at Diſtribution, but muſt take in Conſecration alſo. And our Church does plainly ſhew, that ſhe intends this, in that ſhe does not uſe this Form in the Ordaining of Deacons, for whom ſhe does not intend this power; but only in that of Prieſts, to whoſe Office ſhe thinks this Conſecration requiſite; ſo that it is plain from all this, that our Church does in her Form of Prieſtly Ordination intend, and actually give in her ſenſe, a power of Conſecrating, as well as of diſtributing the Holy Euchariſt.

But if there were nothing of all this expreſſed in the Form of Ordination; but the whole Office did conſiſt only of the Impoſition of hands, and a Prayer accompanying it, That *God would multiply his Heavenly Gifts upon thoſe his Servants whom he had choſen to the Prieſtly Function, that what they had undertaken by his favour, they might accompliſh by his help.* This, in the opinion of their *Marinus*, would have been agreeable to the moſt ancient Cuſtoms, and ſufficient to convey all the powers which are eſſential to the Prieſthood, and among the reſt, this of Conſecrating the Euchariſt: Nay, their own Pope *Innocent* the Fourth has defin'd, that the words, *Be thou a Prieſt*, pronounced with the Impoſition of hands, is a ſufficient Form of Ordination. And if this be ſo, the men of that Church have no reaſon to find fault with the Form eſtabliſhed in ours, as being imperfect or defective in any thing that is neceſſary or eſſential to that Office. But if there be any who deſire to be farther ſatisfied concerning our Forms of Ordination,

Burn. Vind. Page 36.

Page 39.

tion, as to the fullneſs or perfection of them, whether conſidered by themſelves, or in compariſon with thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, they may find a very diſtinct account of this matter in *Maſon's Vindiciæ*, Lib. 2. Cap. 16, 17.

There is but one thing more that has any colour of an Objection againſt our Forms of Ordination, and that does not concern the ſubſtance of them, but the way or manner in which they were at firſt made; which was, that an Act of Parliament made *Anno* 3. & 4. *Edw.* 6. did impower the King to appoint ſix Prelates, and ſix other men of this Realm, learned in Gods Law, to deviſe (or draw up) a Manner or Form of making or conſecrating Arch-biſhops, Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, and that this, when confirmed by the Great Seal, ſhould be lawfully exerciſed and uſed, and none other. Now this ſome are pleaſed to find fault with, and to ſay that our Forms of Ordination were wholly deviſed by, and owe their being to Temporal Authority, and ſo cannot be of force in the Church. As to this we anſwer,

Bram. Prot. Ord. defend. p. 1002.

Firſt, That if, as we have ſeen, theſe Forms are good, as to their ſubſtance; if they have all that is eſſential to thoſe Offices, and are exerciſed by proper perſons upon proper Subjects, they will impreſs the Characters, and produce the Effects which are intended by them: And then it matters not, as to the inward efficacy or validity of them, by what perſons they were deviſed, or by what Authority they were appointed, and ſo our Ordinations would be good in themſelves, though the Forms of them were not deviſed by fit men, nor did proceed from a juſt Authority. But,

Secondly,

Secondly, We say, that these things also were very well secured in this way of proceeding; for the *Parliament*, which is not a meer Civil or Temporal Court, but consists of Ecclesiastical as well as Civil persons, did make choice of this as the most proper and expedite way for the having these Forms rightly and duly prepared, and the persons that were to do it, were six Prelates, and six others, learned in the Law of God, probably six out of each House of Convocation, which were to make a Committee for this purpose, and were to make the Law of God, and the practice of the purest times, their rule in this Matter, and what they did, was to be confirmed by the Royal Authority, that so it might not only have an inward, but also an outward force, and the exercise of it might be allowed of *in foro externo*, and stand good in the eye of the Law. Now this was caution enough in all reason, and what was thus ordered cannot properly be said to be done by a meer Temporal Authority; the Court that appointed this method, being not a meer Temporal Court, and the persons that were to draw up the Forms being Spiritual or Ecclesiastical persons, such as were to be learned in the Laws of God. But,

Thirdly, We affirm, that if all this Caution had not been used, but the King alone, by vertue of his Supremacy, had appointed the persons, and they had drawn the Forms, as these are, agreeably to the Law of God, and the nature of the acts to be done by them; this had been sufficient to have authorized the use of them, and to have made them valid both in Law and Conscience? And for this we have the Examples not only of the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah*,

as of *David*, *Solomon*, *Hezekiah*, and the like; but also of several Christian Emperours, as of *Constantine*, *Theodosius*, *Charles* the Great, *&c.* who called Synods, and appointed Spiritual persons to make Ecclesiastical Canons and Constitutions, and did afterwards confirm these, and make them Authentick in their Dominions by their Royal Sanctions and supreme Authority. And the Kings of *England* are invested with the same Powers and Prerogative in this respect in their own Dominions, as those Kings or Emperours could challenge in theirs.

1 Chron. 13. 2 Chron. 5. 2 Chron. 29. *Mason's Vindiciæ*, Lib. 2. c. 16. p. 212. Edit. Lond. 1638.

And thus we have considered the Forms of Ordination used in our Church, and examined all the material Exceptions which are made against them: And it plainly appears, upon the whole, that, notwithstanding these Exceptions, the Forms themselves are full and valid as to their substance, and established by a very just and lawful Authority, and consequently that they cannot fail of producing their proper effects, if they are but exercised or made use of, by such persons, as are duly qualified for that Ministration; such, I mean, as have themselves a due Mission, and have received that Spiritual power or Jurisdiction, which enables them to apply these Forms, and, by means of them, to impress the Sacred Characters on others. And that our Bishops and Priests have actually this power, and that this is derived or imparted to them by as true a Descent or Succession, as any others can pretend to, is that which I shall in the next place endeavour to prove.

Secondly, By making good this their Mission or Spiritual Jurisdiction against those Exceptions which this Adversary among others has made to it. And the

First

First Exception here is, that they cannot make out their *Succession*, nor shew how they derive this *Mission* from Christ and his Apostles. Now the Mission or Jurisdiction he here speaks of being purely Spiritual, we are ready to joyn issue with him upon this point, that, so far as it is so, it is to be derived immediately from Christ and his Apostles; that is, as *immediately* signifies its coming directly through Spiritual hands, without the Interposition of any Lay or Temporal Authority, as to the Act it self of conferring this Mission.

And here we cannot but think our selves obliged to this Author for putting this Exception in so fair terms, and saying, That *this Mission or Spiritual Jurisdiction are not derived from Kings or Queens, but immediately from Christ by Succession from the Apostles*: for thus he leaves us a very fair Scope, and does not, in terms, confine this Succession to the Chair of St. *Peter*, nor affirm as the Writers of that Church are wont to do, that *the Pope, as St.* Peter's *Successor, is, under Christ, the Fountain of all Spiritual Jurisdiction, and that whatsoever Power of this kind is derived to the present Church, must come either from the Pope himself, or from some Bishops or Metropolitans who borrow this Authority from him.* This I say seems pretty fair, that he does not in terms screw us up to this high pitch as others do; but then it is much to be suspected, that his meaning is the same with theirs, though his words are not; for by asking soon after, whether we think that *the Church of* Rome *sent us to preach the Doctrine of the Thirty nine Articles*, he does plainly insinuate, that if we have not recourse to the Church of *Rome* for this Mission, we had as good not pretend to it at all. Now this being most probably the sense of this Author,

Page 7.

Mason's Vind. Lib. 4. c. 3.

Author, and that which is generally maintained by thoſe of his Party: I ſhall therefore in handling this point of our Spiritual Juriſdiction or Miſſion, endeavour to make out theſe two things.

Firſt, That there is no need or neceſſity for us to repair to the Church of *Rome*, or to make uſe of any Authority from her, for the proving that we derive our Miſſion immediately from Chriſt by Succeſſion from the Apoſtles. And

Secondly, That if there were occaſion for this, we are able, upon their Principles, to derive our Succeſſion from the Apoſtles through this Channel, as well as thoſe who make the greateſt pretentions to it.

Firſt, I ſhall ſhew that there is no need, *&c.* And this will eaſily appear if we conſider theſe particulars.

Firſt, That in the firſt planting or diſſeminating of the Chriſtian Faith, the ſeveral Apoſtles diſperſed themſelves into ſeveral Diſtricts or parts of the World, and though the power or Commiſſion of each of them did extend it ſelf over the whole; yet for the more ſpeedy and eaſie propagating of this Faith, they did each of them betake himſelf to his ſeveral Province, and did there exerciſe and imploy thoſe peculiar gifts which were beſtowed on him in making Proſelites to Chriſtianity, and laying the ground work of a Chriſtian Church. Now whereſoever this was done by any of the Apoſtles, we muſt ſuppoſe that they did not only take care of the preſent, but had alſo a regard for the future; they conſidered of proper means for the keeping up of the Churches they had founded, and for making the Profeſſion of this Faith firm and laſting to Poſterity.

Now one neceſſary means in order to this, muſt be the conſtituting or appointing fit perſons to ſucceed them

them (not in the Apoſtolick Office which was to dye with them, but) in the ordinary inſtructing and governing of the Church; and on theſe perſons they did by Prayer and Impoſition of hands, beſtow that *Spiritual Juriſdiction or Miſſion* which was proper for theſe purpoſes. This method we are aſſured was taken by St. *Paul* in the places where he taught or planted the Goſpel. And we have the ſame reaſon to ſuppoſe that it was obſerved by all the reſt. Now if this were ſo, theſe Churches may derive their Miſſion immediately from Chriſt, and here may be a Succeſſion made out from the Apoſtles without taking *Rome* in the way, or having any recourſe to the *Chair of St. Peter*; for we hope that all the reſt, that were ſo ſtiled in Scripture, were the Apoſtles of Chriſt, as well as St. *Peter*, and had as much Authority to gather a Church, and to appoint their Succeſſor as himſelf had.

We know there are ſome that would perſwade us, that even the Apoſtles themſelves derived their Miſſion or Authority from him; but this is ſo plainly confuted by St. *Paul*, who tells us, That *he was an Apoſtle not of men, neither by man, but by Jeſus Chriſt and God the Father*; and moreover that *in* Antioch *it ſelf, he withſtood* Peter *to the face*; that there can be no colour to any unbiaſſed judgment for ſuch a pretence as this. And therefore it muſt be allowed to be not only poſſible, but neceſſary, for the Churches thus planted to derive their Succeſſion from the Apoſtles, without having any recourſe to *Rome*, or any dependence on *St. Peter's Chair*. And as this is true in the general, ſo we may conſider in the ſecond place. Gal. 1. 1. c. 2. 11.

Secondly, That as to that part or branch of the Chriſtian Church which was firſt planted or founded

in this Iſland, if we look back into thoſe accounts which the beſt Authors have left us of the time when, and the perſons by whom it was planted, we ſhall find very little ground for the aſcribing this to St. *Peter*, or to any other Biſhop of *Rome*; but ſhall ſee much more reaſon to believe that it was done by ſome of the other Apoſtles, or at leaſt by thoſe who were commiſſioned and ſent by them. For,

Maſon's Vind. Lib. 2. c. 2. p. 64.

First, As to the time when Chriſtianity was firſt planted in *Britain*, we find that *Gildas*, *the moſt ancient of our Britiſh Hiſtorians*, not only tells us in the general, That it was done *Sub initio orti Evangelii*, *In the very beginning or birth of the Goſpel*, but does alſo more diſtinctly ſet down the preciſe time when it was done, ſaying, *That to this cold and frozen Iſland, ſo far removed from the viſible Sun, Chriſt the true Sun was pleaſed to indulge his beams, that is, his Precepts*, Tempore, ut ſcimus, ſummo Tiberii Cæſaris, *In the latter end of the Reign of* Tiberius Ceſar, *when his Religion was propagated without any impediment.* Here we may obſerve that *Gildas* affirms this as a thing very well known, and of which there was no doubt or diſpute to be made; he mentions indeed, as one ground of this knowledge, that Decree of *Tiberius*, ſpoken of by *Tertullian* and *Euſebius*, *by which the Perſecution was taken off from the Chriſtians, and death was threatened to their accuſers, ſo that the Goſpel had now a free courſe, that which hindered its ſpreading being thus taken away.*

Uſher de primord. Eccleſ. Britan. p. 3. Edit. Dublin. 1639.

Tertul. Apol. c. 5. Euſeb. Chron.

Now *Baronius* places the death of *Tiberius* in the thirty ninth year of Chriſt; and the ſame *Baronius* tells us, *That it was the opinion commonly received, that St.* Peter *came not to* Rome *till the ſecond year of* Claudius Ceſar, *which was the fourty fourth year of Chriſt*: So that if we give any credit to this account of *Gildas*,

Baron. Annal. Tom. 1. An. 39, 40.

we

we must allow that Christianity came into *Britain* at least five years before St. *Peter*'s coming to *Rome*, so that it could not be planted here by him, or by any Authority from him, as Bishop of that See.

There are others indeed (among whom is *William* of *Malmsbury*) who set the coming of *Joseph* of *Arimathea* (whom they conceive to have been the first planter of Christianity in *Britain*) somewhat later, *viz.* in the sixty third year of Christ, which computation if we should allow of, and observe with all, that *Onuphrius* in his Notes upon *Platina*, in the Life of St. Peter, proves, that *St.* Peter *did never visit these Western parts of* Europe, *till after* Nero's *burning of* Rome, *and banishing the Christians from thence, as being guilty of it (which burning, according to* Baronius, *was in the sixty sixth year of Christ,)* we shall be sensible that, according to this account, St. *Peter*'s arrival in this Island for the planting of Christianity (if it were at all) could not be till three years after that of *Joseph* and his Company; so that even by this account, he could lay no claim to the first planting or founding of Christianity in this Island. And thus from the accounts which are given us of the time when this Island did first receive the Christian Faith, there does appear little or no ground for the ascribing this to St. *Peter*, or to the *Roman See*. And there will appear yet less, if we consider,

Mason's Vind. p. 73, 74.

Secondly, The accounts that we have concerning the persons by whom this Faith is said to have been first planted. And this indeed is by ancient Writers attributed to several persons; but I shall not need to take notice of more than three of these, who seem to have the fairest pretentions to it.

The first is *Joseph* of *Arimathea*, whom I mentioned before; and 'tis plain that the *old Traditions of this*

Nation do run very high in favour of him, and though there are mixt with theſe Traditions ſome fond ſtories, ſuch as favour of the ſuperſtition of the later Ages, which made the learned *Uſher* ſuppoſe them not to be earlier than the Northern Conqueſt, yet there ſeems to be ſomething of ſubſtance or reality at the bottom, upon which the old Monks did, in this, as in other caſes, take occaſion to build their fooliſh Fables and feigned Miracles: And that there was ſuch a Foundation as this, we are induced to believe,

Uſher de Prim. c. 2.

Baron. Annal. Tom. 1. An. 35.

Firſt, In that it is acknowledged by *Baronius*, That *in the diſperſion which followed upon the death of St.* Stephen, *St.* Joſeph *of* Arimathea *came in company with ſome others into* Gaul, *and from thence ſailed over into Britain, where after he had preached the Goſpel, he ended his days*; and this, he tells us, he has *out of a Manuſcript Hiſtory of the Engliſh lying in the Vatican Library.* Now this being told as ſo credible a thing, by a Writer of ſo much judgment and reputation, as the Cardinal *Baronius*, muſt deſerve ſome credit with that Church, which has ſo great a value for his Annals. But,

Uſher de Prim. c. 2. p. 15.

Secondly, *William* of *Malmsbury*, who gives an account at large of the coming of *St. Joſeph* and his twelve Companions into *Britain*, tells us, *That they were ſent out of* Gaul *by the Apoſtle St.* Philip, *to whoſe ſhare the Province of* Gaul *was allotted upon the general diſperſion or dividing of the Apoſtles*, which he relates upon the Authority of *Freculphus*. And he, as the learned *Uſher* aſſerts, has it word for word out of *Iſidore*; which *Iſidore* together with *Julian* Arch-biſhop of *Toledo*, and venerable *Bede* do agree, that *Gaul* was aſſigned to St. *Philip* as his Province, and *that he did, by the preacking of the Goſpel, bring thoſe barbarous Nations which were Neighbours to darkneſs, and borderers upon*

upon the Ocean, to the light of the truth, and to the haven of Faith. Now if *St. Philip* did himself preach the Gospel in *Gaul*, as these Authors assert, this makes it probable, that he might take so much care of *this neighbouring Island*, as to send *St. Joseph* and his Companions to carry on the same work here, as himself did there, the condition of the *Britains* requiring it, and both his own and his Missionaries Zeal prompting them to it. But besides this foreign and collateral evidence, we have,

Thirdly, As good and direct proof of this at home, as is ordinarily required in the like cases; for we are told by our oldest Historians, *That there was a Church and Covent built at* Glastenbury, *either by these Persons themselves, or soon after them, in memory of their coming hither, and having the first hand in planting the Christian Faith.* We are told, that *when this first House was grown old, a new one was built by a Bishop of St.* David's *upon the same account, and that when this also was gone to decay, it was pulled down, and a more ample one built by* Ina *a Saxon King, above nine hundred years since, and that still the same Tradition was kept on foot. And when this House of* Ina's *building happened to be burnt in the Reign of King* Henry *the Second, he not only rebuilt it, but caused a diligent search to be made for all the Writings and Charters that could be found concerning its Antiquity and Priviledges: By which it appeared that many of the most ancient Saxon Kings had been Benefactors to it, and had granted it great Priviledges on this account, that they looked upon it to be of the greatest Antiquity, and to have been founded at first by these Disciples of our Lord.* Now greater proof than this of any so ancient Tradition, cannot well be given: And therefore we may with reason conclude from hence,

Malm. *Mason's Vind.* Page 71.

Mason, p. 70.

hence, that there is some ground for this Tradition, and if so, then 'tis plain that Christianity did not come into *Britain* by the way of *Rome*, but by that of *Gaul*, not from *St. Peter*, but from *St. Philip*. But there is,

Secondly, A second Person, who seems to have a very fair claim to this Honour of having a hand in the first planting of Christianity here, and that is *the great Apostle of the Gentiles St. Paul*. And the Testimonies for him are,

First, That of *Theodoret*, who upon the 2 *Tim.* 4. 16, 17. observes, That *when he had appealed to* Cesar, *and was sent to* Rome *by* Festus, *his defence being heard, he was acquitted, and being so, he took a Journey into* Spain, *and made Excursions into other Nations, and brought the light of the Gospel to them.*

Vber de Prim. c. 1. p. 8.

Secondly, That of *Venantius Fortunatus*, who in his Third Book *De vita Martini*, says expressly concerning *St. Paul*,

Transiit Oceanum, vel qua facit Insula portum,
Quasque Britannus *habet terras, quasque ultima* Thule.

that is, *He passed the Seas, and made Voyages into the most remote Islands of* Britain *and* Thule.

Thirdly, That of *Sophronias the Patriarch of Jerusalem*, who in his Sermon on the Birth-days of the Apostles, affirms that *St. Paul did preach the Gospel, both to the Spaniards and Britains*, and an ancient Translator of *St. Chrysostom's* Sermon on the Pentecost, intimates that *St. Paul did fetch a compass from Spain to the utmost parts of the Earth*. And indeed it were much to be wondered at, if in *the thirty five years, which he is said to have spent in continual Travels and Peregrinations through the World*, he should never so much as touch at this famous Island, especially when he was so near it as the Country of *Spain*.

Nicephorus Lib. 2. c. 34.

We

We may add to all this, that which is mentioned in the Calendars or Menologies of the Greek Church concerning *Ariſtobulus*, which is, That *he, being one of the Seventy Diſciples, followed St. Paul, preaching the Goſpel, and every where Miniſtring to him, by whom he was ordained a Biſhop for the Country of the Britains, a fierce and cruel ſort of men, and though he was by them ſometimes ſeverely beaten, and other whiles dragged through their Streets, yet he prevailed with many to joyn themſelves to Chriſt: And thus having formed ſome Churches, and ordained Prieſts and Deacons in them, he ended his Life.* Vher de Prim. c. 1. p. 9.

Here we have an account of a Companion, who did either come with *St. Paul*, or was ſent over by him into *Britain*, and was made a Biſhop on purpoſe that he might be impowered to ordain, or conſtitute others to inſtruct and govern the Church that he planted here, and ſo there might be a Succeſſion of Biſhops derived here from the Apoſtles of Chriſt, and that not from *St. Peter*, but from *St. Paul.*

Thirdly, The third Perſon, for whom this Honour is claimed, is *St. Peter*, but the chief Authority on which this claim depends, is that of *Simeon Metaphraſtes*, who tells us, as from *Euſebius*, that *when St.* Peter *had ſtayed twelve years in the Eaſt, he came and ſpent three and twenty years at* Rome, *and in* Britain, *and in the Cities of the Weſt*: And he adds, that *St. Peter having continued a long time in* Britain, *and brought over many nameleſs Nations to the Faith of Chriſt, when he had inlightened many with the word of Grace; when he had conſtituted Churches, and ordained Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, in the Twelfth year of* Nero *he returned to* Rome. Now here we may take notice, Vher de Prim. c. 1. p. 7.

Firſt, That nothing of all this is now to be found in *Euſebius*, whom this Author cites for it.

Secondly,

Secondly, That he stands alone in this relation, and has no Writer of any Antiquity to back him in it. And,

Thirdly, That he is one whose credit runs very low, even among those who do most favour this claim of *St. Peter*; for *Baronius* himself, when he cites him, is forced to add, *If any credit he to be given to* Metaphrastes: And in another place, *'Tis certain that he mistakes in many other things affirmed by him*: So that if we compare the Authorities upon which the several Traditions are built, concerning the first planting of Christianity in *Britain*, we shall find that there are much higher grounds of probability in either of the former, than in this which attributes it to *St. Peter*, and consequently that, if we are to derive our Episcopal Succession from the Apostles, we are to look for it, not as coming through the hands of *St. Peter*, but through those of *St. Philip* or *St. Paul*.

Baron. Annal. Ann 44. n. 38. ibid. n. 54.

But here *Parsons the Jesuite*, and the other Champions for *Rome*, tell us, that *this first planting of the Faith, and making Proselites to Christianity, was but poor and inconsiderable, if compared with that more publick and remarkable one, which followed in the days of King* Lucius, *and Pope* Eleutherius, *when the King and the Nation were converted in a very solemn manner; the King sending two Ambassadors to the Pope with Letters signifying the great desire he had to be made a Christian through his means, and requesting that the way might be opened by himself and his Ministers, for his taking upon him the Christian profession; which request was granted by the Pope, who did immediately send over two Legates to initiate the King, and others instructed in the Christian Religion, into the Mysteries or Sacraments of that Religion, which thing they did with all diligence perform*: And they were so successful in this undertaking, that

Parson's de Angl. Conver. Part 1, c. 4.

Baron. Annal. An. 183. n. 4.

not

not only the King and his Family, but according to *Geoffrey* of *Monmouth*, *the whole People of the Country, following their Kings example, were cleanſed with the ſame Baptiſm, and reſtored to the heavenly Kingdom, inſomuch that Paganiſm was deſtroyed and extinguiſhed, almoſt through the whole Iſland.* Hiſtor. Britan. Lib. 1. c. 1.

Now this, they ſay, does moſt properly deſerve to be ſtiled a converting of the Nation, or a planting of the Faith in it, and what went before was very little, and obſcure, in reſpect of this, and to whomſoever that is to be aſcribed, 'tis certain, that this full light and total Converſion is owing to *Rome*, and derived from the Pope. As to this, we readily allow that it was at this time that the Goſpel began to be publickly received here, and Chriſtianity to be owned as the National Religion, nor are we willing to detract from the Honour of Pope *Eleutherius* and his Legates, or to deny them the ſhare which they may juſtly challenge in this great work; but after all, we cannot ſo properly call this the planting of this Faith, as the watering that which was already planted, we cannot ſay, that this was the ſowing the firſt Seeds of the Goſpel, but rather the opening of the ground, and giving warmth to the ſoyl, that ſo theſe ſeeds might more freely ſhoot forth, and the plant might more kindly flouriſh and enlarge it ſelf; for though this made a conſiderable change as to the outward ſtate or profeſſion of the Chriſtian Religion, yet it cannot be denied but that this Faith was, and might ſtill have been privately profeſſed and maintained by a ſmaller, but a more ſincere company of Chriſtians, though there had not, as yet, been ſo publick a Converſion, though neither the *King* nor the *Pope* had concerned themſelves about the ſpreading of this Faith, or given this incou-

ragement to the growth of it. So that whatever advantages the favourers of *Rome* do pretend to from the *Popes* promoting this publick Conversion of the *King* and *Nation*, yet this will not give him the honour of the first planting this Faith among us, nor oblige us to derive either our Religion or Episcopal Succession from the *Roman See*. And this will plainly appear if these two things be allowed, which we suppose the Writers on that side will not deny:

First, That, as I said but now, there was, even at this time of the Conversion of King *Lucius*, an obscure Party or Company of Christians which remained, and had their Religion propagated to them from the first plantation of it: And to this *Gildas* does plainly bear witness, telling us, That *though at the first preaching of the Gospel, the Precepts of Christ were but coldly received by the* Britains, *yet they did remain, and were professed, by some more throughly, and by others less, even till* Diocletian's *Persecution*, which was more than a Century after this Conversion of King *Lucius*. And this is confirmed by that account which *Bulæus* gives, and *Baronius* from him, of the manner in which King *Lucius* was converted; for he tells us that *the King was at first a little scandalized, as the Jews were, at the poverty of Christ; for though the Christian Religion had now been propagated in* Britain *more than an hundred years, yet it seemed to him to want a due splendor or greatness, because hitherto it had been administered* per solos pauperes, abjectos, & simplices homines; *Only by poor, abject and plain men, at least not supported by the Roman Authority: But when he had heard by* Cesar's *Officers, or Lieutenants,* Trebellius, *and* Pertinax, *that some of the greatest men among the* Romans, *when the Persecutions were ceased, had embraced this Religion, he began to look upon it as a more honourable thing.*

Usher de Prim. c. 4. p. 52.

Usher de Prim. c. 4. p. 48.

Now

Now if this account be true, it appears from hence, both that the Christian Faith was at this time professed in *Britain*, though the Persons who professed it were in the eyes of the Heathen mean and abject; and also that the chief reason why King *Lucius* applied himself to the Bishop of *Rome* to assist him in his Conversion, was, because that he had been informed by the *Romans* here in *Britain*, that this Religion was in greater repute, and was professed by Persons of a greater Rank or Figure at *Rome*, than any of those were who had embraced it here; from all which it appears that there were Christians here in *Britain*, but they were not so great or considerable, as those at *Rome*. And,

Secondly, As it cannot well be denied but there was a remnant of Christians in *Britain* from the first to this second Conversion, so it must in all reason be supposed that there was a Succession of Bishops during that space, to take care of, and preside over, this remnant, and that these derived their Mission, and had their Authority from those first Planters of the Faith whoever they were. This I say must in reason be supposed on these grounds.

First, That this was the Form of Church-Government, which was every where established by those first Planters of the Gospel: And this is allowed of by all that are versed in the Histories or Antiquities of the Christian Church, that whersoever there was any thing of the face of a Church, the Government or chief Administration of it, was in the hands of Bishops. Thus we know St. *Paul* did appoint in the Churches of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, and it is not to be doubted but he did the same in all other Churches of his Plantation; and whether he or St. *Philip* had the planting of this, we cannot question but they used the same

See the learned Bishop of St. *Asaph*'s Historical Account of Church-Government in Great *Britain*, especially, c. 3.

method here, as in other places: And, if we give any credit to the *Calendar* of the *Greek Church*, we may ſee, that St. *Paul* did actually appoint *Ariſtobulus* the firſt Biſhop here, as he did *Timothy* and *Titus* in thoſe other Churches.

Secondly, We find that, according to all accounts, there were more than an hundred years between the firſt and ſecond converſion of the *Britains*, and yet, according to *Gildas* and *Balæus*, there was a Seminary or Party of Chriſtians among them all that while. Now it cannot well be conceived how this Seminary ſhould be kept up, without having ſome among them endued with an Epiſcopal Power, ſuch as were able to impreſs the Character of Prieſthood on others, and ſo make them fit to adminiſter the Word and Sacraments, to inſtruct and build up others in that moſt Holy Religion, I ſay, it cannot be conceived how the Chriſtian Faith ſhould be kept up and propagated from one Age to another, without a Succeſſion of ſuch Perſons as were duly qualified to perform thoſe Offices which were neceſſary for the maintaining of Religion, and for making the Profeſſors of it compleat or perfect Chriſtians, that is, partakers both of the Word and Sacraments: And theſe ends were not to be attained, according to the ſenſe of the Primitive Church, without the Epiſcopal Order, without thoſe who were the very Heads or Springs of this Adminiſtration.

We muſt then allow that there were Biſhops in this Church, and we muſt ſuppoſe theſe to be included among *thoſe poor and abject men* mentioned by *Balæus*, that is, ſuch as ſeemed ſo in the eyes of the Heathen, as being poſſeſſed of a meer Spiritual Authority, ſuch as made no outward ſhew or appearance of grandeur; but

but however, the Christian Religion was, as he says, administred by them, and they performed all the Offices which belonged to that Administration, though they were not so much regarded, or had in esteem by the *King and his Court*, as *the Bishop and Clergy of Rome*, who lived in an Imperial City, where Christianity had gained ground among the great ones, and was now profess'd by some of the Senators themselves. But,

Thirdly, It makes very much for this opinion, That there were some of the Episcopal Order here in *Britain*, even then, when Pope *Eleutherius* sent his Legates to King *Lucius*; because these Legates themselves were no Bishops but Priests only: And this appears both from the Testimony of *Thomas Rudburnus in Chronico minore*, who tells us expressly, that *Eleutherius sent two Presbyters* Fagatius *and* Dumianus *to King* Lucius, *who receiving the Rule of Faith from them, ordained or appointed eight and twenty Bishops*, &c. And also from that of *William of Malmsbury* in his Book of the Antiquity of *Glastenbury* Church, who says, that *when these two Legates, whom he calls* Faganus *and* Dervianus, *had gone preaching and baptizing through the parts of* Britain, *they came to the Island of* Avallonia, *where they found the old Church built, as 'tis said, by the hands of Christs Disciples, and having found it, they were filled with unspeakable joy, and there they spent nine years in giving Praises to God.*

Usher de Prim. c. 5. p. 58.

Usher c. 6. p. 104, 105.

Now here we are told that these Legates did only preach and baptize, which are the Offices not only of Bishops, but of Priests, and that when they had done this, they spent nine years in a Retirement, only in praising or giving Glory to God, which space they could not have addicted wholly to that imployment, if they had been Bishops, and taken up with the duties belonging

belonging to that Function. Now then if theſe were no more than Prieſts, and theſe were all that were ſent by the *Pope* to convert the *King* to Chriſtianity, and to adviſe him concerning the erecting or eſtabliſhing of Biſhopricks, as 'tis ſaid they did, then the Biſhops, which were at firſt put into the Poſſeſſion of theſe Sees, muſt either be ſuch as were Biſhops before, as to their Spiritual Miſſion or Juriſdiction; or elſe ſuch as were now newly conſecrated or ſet apart for that Office: But by whom ſhould theſe be conſecrated? The Legates had no power to do this, and we hear of none that were ſent to be conſecrated at *Rome*, unleſs it were *Elvanus* one of the Kings Ambaſſadors to the *Pope*; and he muſt either conſecrate the reſt himſelf, which is not held for good by the Canons of the Church of *Rome*; or elſe he muſt joyn with ſome others here at home, who were already poſſeſſed of that Character, which, 'tis moſt probable he did, and ſo filled up the number of Biſhops which is mentioned by our Hiſtorians.

Now if this be allowed, as in all reaſon it muſt be, it follows from hence, that there was a Succeſſion not only of Chriſtians, but of Biſhops too, from the firſt planting of Chriſtianity in *Britain*, and conſequently, that though this more publick Converſion of the *Britains* be aſcribed to Pope *Elentherius*, yet this does not oblige us to derive our Epiſcopal Succeſſion from *Rome*. And if theſe things are but duly and impartially weighed, we doubt not but they will be abundantly ſufficient to make out the truth of our firſt propoſition, which was, that there is no neceſſity for us to repair to the Church of *Rome*, or to make uſe of any Authority from her for the proving, That we derive our Miſſion or Spiritual Juriſdiction immediately from Chriſt by Succeſſion from the Apoſtles. And ſo I paſs,

Secondly,

Secondly, To the second Proposition, which was, That if there were any need of this, we of the Church of *England*, as it is reformed and distinguished from that of *Rome*, are able to derive our Succession, even through this Channel, as well as those who make the greatest pretentions to it; for allowing here what they seem to demand, that Christianity was either planted here at first by St. *Peter*, and so the most ancient Succession both of Christians and Bishops was derived from him; or else, that if any other of the Apostles had the planting of it, yet that this Primitive Foundation was wholly destroyed, and ruined by the flowing in of Heathenism and Barbarity upon it, and so all the Christianity which these after Ages can pretend to here in *Britain*, owes its original, either to Pope *Eleutherius*, and his Legates in the Reign of King *Lucius*, or else to Pope *Gregory* the First, and *Austin* the Monk his Deputy, in that of King *Ethelbert*, I say allowing all this, and letting them take their choice which of these two Popes they will make the source or Fountain of this Succession, we are able to derive ours through this Channel, as well as themselves.

And here our Adversaries will readily allow, that this Succession may be sufficiently made out, even from the time of King *Lucius* to the beginning of the Reformation, that is, though there are no Records now extant to prove this for a great part of this time, yet they make no doubt, but that the Succession went on here as regularly, as in any other Churches, where these Records have likewise perished, and been worn out by length of time.

All the Dispute then between us here, is about the carrying on of this Succession in the times when this Church began to be reformed or distinguished from that

that of *Rome*. And even here we find no queſtion made, at leaſt not inſiſted on, as to any of thoſe Conſecrations which were made before the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*; for we know that both the Conſecrations of Biſhops, and Ordinations of Prieſts, which had been made in the latter end of King *Henry* the Eighth, and in the Reign of King *Edward* the Sixth, were allowed to be valid, and the Perſons ſo conſecrated or ordained, were reconciled by Cardinal *Poole*, and received under the ſame Characters into the Church of *Rome*, provided they renounced that which was termed their Hereſie, and returned into the boſom of that Church; ſo that the Succeſſion went on, as to theſe Perſons, by the means of theſe Conſecrations, and the Characters were looked upon to be good enough in themſelves, if the Perſons, who were poſſeſſed of them, were ſuch as that Church approved of. But the main Conteſt here, is concerning thoſe Conſecrations which were the firſt in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, eſpecially that of Archbiſhop *Parker* himſelf, which, having ſo great an influence on thoſe that followed, is therefore mainly laid at, and objected againſt by our Adverſaries. And the Attempts that have been made upon it are of two very different kinds.

Vide Biſhop *Bramhall's* Conſecration of Proteſtant Biſhops vindicated, p. 444.

First, The former are ſuch as have gone about to prove this Conſecration invalid, becauſe it was not done exactly according to the Mode or Form preſcribed by the Church of *Rome*, that is, becauſe either the Form it ſelf of Conſecration was inſufficient, or this Form was not adminiſtred by fit and competent Perſons. And theſe were the Objections which were urged againſt this Conſecration by *Harding*, *Stapleton*, *Briſtow*, *Alan*, and the reſt who wrote any thing on this ſubject at the beginning of the Reformation: And they have been

been fully and frequently anſwered by thoſe Proteſtants who took up the Controverſie, and wrote in defence of this Conſecration: And as to the Form it ſelf, this being the ſame which was eſtabliſhed in the Reign of King *Edward* the Sixth, and has ſtill been in uſe in this Church, that this is ſufficient for this purpoſe, and has in it all that is eſſential or neceſſary to the making of a Biſhop, is what we have already proved in theſe Papers.

All that ſeems to require a farther anſwer, is, That *Parker* being conſidered as an Archbiſhop or Metropolitan, it is queſtioned whether this Form were ſufficient to conſtitute him ſuch, the Ceremony of the Pall being omitted, and the reſt of the Office being performed by thoſe who were to be his Inferiors, and ſubject to his Juriſdiction. As to the Ceremony of the Pall, we affirm that it was never uſed here in *Britain* for the firſt ſix hundred years after Chriſt, and when it began to be uſed, it was only looked on as an honourary thing, and beſtowed by the *Popes* as a Mark of their eſteem and kindneſs for the Perſons to whom it was ſent; not but that they were as compleat Archbiſhops or Metropolitans before, as after they had received it; otherwiſe there muſt have been more in *Britain* from the time of Pope *Eleutherius* to that of Pope *Gregory*.

Vide Biſhop *Bramhall's* Juſt Vindication of the Church of *England*, p. 98.

But in after-times, this, as well as other things, became vendible at *Rome*, and great Sums of Money, together with an Oath of Obedience or Submiſſion to the Pope, were exacted before it could be obtained: And though this was ſeveral times complained of both by our Engliſh Kings and Biſhops, yet no remedy could be had for it; ſo that the thing it ſelf being altogether needleſs, and of no moment as to the eſſence of Conſecration, and having ſuch groſs Abuſes and Corruptions attending it, it might very ſafely and warrantably be

Archbiſhop *Cranmer's* Fees for the Bulls relating to his Conſecration were 900 Ducats. *Maſon's* vind. Lib. 4. c. 14. p. 526.

laid aſide, and yet the Subſtance or Eſſence of that Office be preſerved perfect and entire without it. And then for his being conſecrated by ſuch Perſons as were to be under his Juriſdiction after his Conſecration,

Firſt, We ſay that as to the Power of conferring the Order of Epiſcopacy, this is common to all thoſe who have themſelves received that Order, and they have it all equally or alike by vertue of their own Conſecration; for it is the inward Character which gives this Power, and not any addition or extent of outward Juriſdiction. And this we conceive will not be denied by our Adverſaries. And then,

Burnet's Vindication, p. 81. Secondly, For the inveſting a Biſhop thus conſecrated with the power of a Metropolitan; this was moſt anciently done by the Biſhops of that Province over which he was to have Juriſdiction; nor is there any inſtance to the contrary for the firſt three hundred years; 'tis true the Patriarchs did afterwards pretend to this within their ſeveral Patriarchates, but yet

Can. 7. we find that in the Council of *Orleance*, held in the year five hundred and thirty eight, it was decreed, That the ancient Cuſtom ſhould be renewed, *viz.* That a Metropolitan being elected by the Biſhops of the Province, with the Clergy, and the People, ſhould be ordained by all the Biſhops of the Province met together; by which it appears, that a Confirmation from *Rome* was not thought needful in thoſe days, but the Biſhops of the Province might ordain or inveſt him to whoſe Juriſdiction they were to be ſubject: And if this be not allowed of, we would fain know, how it can be proper for the Cardinals to Inſtall or Inveſt the Pope in a Juriſdiction above themſelves, ſuch an one as they muſt own themſelves ſubject to, as ſoon as they have inſtalled him in it, and if this be not improper in that caſe, we can ſee as little impropriety in the other. But

But it is ſtill urged, that in this caſe of Archbiſhop *Parker*, there was not a competent number of Biſhops or Perſons duly qualified for the conferring this Conſecration or Juriſdiction upon him. In anſwer to which we maintain both that the number was ſufficient, and the Perſons ſuch againſt whom there lay no juſt exception. And,

Firſt, For the number, we know that the Fourth Council of *Carthage* (whoſe Canons are received and looked on as authentick by the Church of *Rome*) does in her ſecond Canon require no more than three Biſhops as neceſſary for the due Adminiſtration of this Rite, and accordingly the *Roman Pontifical* it ſelf does, of neceſſity, preſcribe no more. Now if this number be allowed for ſufficient, there could be no defect in this caſe; for here were four Biſhops preſent, and aſſiſting at the Ceremony, *viz.* *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodgskin*, as does plainly appear by the Regiſters that are ſtill kept of this Tranſaction, and which have been publiſhed by *Maſon* and others. And then, *Maſon's* Vind. Lib. 3. c. 9.

Secondly, As to the qualifications of theſe Perſons, The ſame *Maſon* has proved at large, That every one of theſe had been duly conſecrated, and received the Character of a Biſhop, *Barlow* and *Hodgskin* in the Reign of King *Henry* the Eighth, *Scory* and *Coverdale* in that of King *Edward* the Sixth. And this Character being according to the Roman Doctrine, indelible, and always continuing with the Perſon that has received it, this muſt inable him, in conjunction with a fit number of others of the ſame order, to convey this Character to whom they pleaſe by the uſe of ſuch a Form, as is proper for this purpoſe. Lib. 3. c. 10.

Now if this be allowed, then the Exceptions that are made againſt theſe Biſhops, *viz.* That three of them

were not poſſeſſed of any Biſhopricks at the time when they joyned in this Conſecration, and the fourth was no more than a Suffragan, can be of no weight to render them unfit for this Office; for theſe are only external and accidental things, ſuch as have no influence upon the Character it ſelf, as to the giving or taking it away; but this, when it is once given, remains the ſame, whether the Perſon who has it be poſſeſſed of a proper Dioceſs to act in or not: And thoſe who will offer to deny this, muſt, at the ſame time, condemn *Athanaſius* and *Liberius*, and all the reſt of the Orthodox Biſhops, who did preſume to ordain Prieſts, and conſecrate Biſhops, when they were under Perſecution, and turned out of their Biſhopricks by the prevailing *Arrians*. And for Suffragans, theſe being conſecrated after the ſame manner with other Biſhops, and being made on purpoſe to aſſiſt them in thoſe acts which are proper to them as Biſhops, the acts which they do of this kind, muſt be allowed for good and valid, though they are not poſſeſſed of any Dioceſs or Juriſdiction, which is properly their own; ſo that we ſee theſe Exceptions are very weak and inſufficient for the proving the Perſon thus conſecrated to be no true Biſhop, or no compleat Metropolitan: And as his Conſecration ſtands good in deſpight of theſe Exceptions, ſo will all thoſe that have ſince followed it upon the ſame grounds.

Vide *Maſon*'s Vindiciæ, Lib. 3. c. 12, 13.

And thus the Succeſſion of Biſhops in this reformed Church has, through the Divine Providence, kept on clear and undiſturbed, and is derived ſo, even through the Roman Channel, to theſe very days in which we live. And theſe, as I ſaid, are the main Objections and Anſwers which were made concerning this Matter in the beginning of the Reformation, and we hear of no other for almoſt the whole Reign of Queen

Queen *Elizabeth*; but just upon the expiring of it we find,

Secondly, A second sort of Attempts made, and exceptions started against these Church of *England* Consecrations: And these were grounded upon a senseless Story forged by one *Neal*, sometime Chaplain to Bishop *Bonner*, concerning a Consecration made, once upon a time, at the Nags-head Tavern in *Cheapside*, a Story so ridiculous in it self, and so often exposed already to the scorn of all ingenuous Readers, that it could never be revived or set on foot again, but by such a Scribler as this, who, as I said, writes for the Rabble, and supposes they will swallow any thing he gives them, without inquiring any farther.

And indeed he seems to be conscious to himself that this Story will not bear the sifting; and therefore he does only give it a slight touch, so as that it may pass among the Vulgar for a merry Tale, and serve them to repartee with in common Discourse, when they are at a dead lift. All that he brings to countenance or support this Fable is, That *no Witness or Register was* Page 9. *ever produced to prove that this Consecration of Archbishop* Parker *was not at the Nags-head Tavern, but in the Chappel at* Lambeth, *till about fifty four years after the time when it was done, when the pretended Witnesses on the other side were dead, and past giving their Testimony in this case.* As to which we answer,

First, That though those Registers were not published at their full length, yet they were plainly referred to, and this Consecration of Archbishop *Parker* was owned to be authentick by two very publick Acts, even during his own life-time: The one was an Act of Parliament made in the Eighth year of Queen *Elizabeth*, *Entitled an Act declaring the making and consecrating*

crating of the Archbiſhops and Biſhops of this Realm to be good, lawful, and perfect: In the body of which Act, it is expreſly affirmed, *That it is, and may be very evident and apparent, that no cauſe of ſcruple, ambiguity, or doubt can or may juſtly be objected againſt the Elections, Confirmations or Conſecrations of theſe Archbiſhops or Biſhops, or any other material thing meet to be uſed or had in or about the ſame; but that every thing requiſite and material for that purpoſe, hath been made and done as preciſely, and with as great care and diligence, or rather more, as ever the like was done before her Majeſties time, as the Records of her Majeſties Fathers and Brothers time, and alſo of her own time, will more plainly teſtifie and declare.* Here we have the Authority of the Nation aſſembled in Parliament, bearing witneſs to the regularity and exactneſs of this Conſecration, and appealing to thoſe Regiſters or Records which were then in being, and might be looked into by thoſe who doubted the truth of theſe Matters, and this within little more than ſeven years after the thing it ſelf was done.

The other publick Act evidencing that there were ſuch Regiſters kept, is a Book of the Lives of Seventy Archbiſhops of *Canterbury*, which was publiſhed in the year 1572. in which this Conſecration of Archbiſhop *Parker* is particularly related, and atteſted as the reſt are: And this was within thirteen years of the time when the thing was done, and yet no *Neal* appeared to contradict any thing of this, to ſay there were no Regiſters to prove the fact, or that there was any good proof to be made that the Conſecration was done after another manner. Now theſe two publick Acts paſſing without any reflection or contradiction from the other ſide, are ſufficient to ſhew that there were ſuch Regiſters then in being, which might have been publiſhed

at

at length, if the oppoſite party had preſumed to call it in queſtion, or had been bold enough to forge this *Nags-head* ſtory in thoſe more early days. But we anſwer,

Secondly, That as to the publiſhing of theſe Regiſters, and ſo confuting the Fable we have been ſpeaking of, there is a very plain reaſon why this was not ſooner done, which is, that the Fable it ſelf was not broached, at leaſt not made publick, till after the year 1600. that is, till above forty years after this Conſecration; for 'tis evident, that neither *Harding*, nor *Stapleton*, nor *Briſtow*, nor any other Author who wrote before that time (though they raked together all that they had to ſay againſt this Conſecration) did ever mention any ſuch Story: They urged indeed that there was not a ſufficient number of Biſhops for the doing it, and that they did not uſe a proper Form, and the like, but there was no objection made, as to the place in which it was done, nor does any one of them affirm that it was not done in a Chappel, but in a Tavern: Nay *Sanders* himſelf, whoſe Hiſtory reaches from the 21*th* year of *Henry* the Eighth, to the 28*th* year of Queen *Elizabeth*, has not one word of this *Nags-head* Story, though he makes it his buſineſs all along to load the Reformation with all the Scandals he had heard or could invent. So that we may well ſuppoſe that neither he nor his brethren had as yet heard any thing of this Monſter, nay they cannot, as I ſaid, produce ſo much as one Author of their own that ſpeaks of it before the year 1600. And how then can they expect that it ſhould be as yet anſwered?

Vide *Bramhall* Conſecration of Proteſtant Biſhops vindicated, p. 438.

Is it an uſual thing for Lyes to be confuted before they have ever been told? or do they imagine that we are able to foreſee all the Stories which 'tis poſſible for them to invent? but when once this Story came

came abroad and was made publick, it did not go long without an anſwer. And to let the World ſee how much it had been abuſed by this late Romance, an account was given by Mr. *Maſon* of thoſe Regiſters which were faithfully preſerved, and where any man, that pleaſed, might ſee it plainly and undeniably atteſted, that this Ceremony was performed in the Chappel at *Lambeth*, with all the Decency and Solemnity which became ſo Sacred an Action: The oppoſite Party, who had ſet this Story about, began to be ſtartled at this, and having no other ſhift left, they reſolve boldly to tell the World, that theſe Regiſters were forged by *Maſon*, and all the reaſon they give for this, is becauſe they had not been ſooner publiſhed, when, in truth, there had not, till now, been any occaſion given for the making them publick.

But to convince them that theſe Regiſters were true and authentick; when * *Fitz. Herbert* (one of thoſe who made it their buſineſs to have the other Story believed) made it his requeſt (being himſelf at *Rome*) to have theſe Regiſters ſhewn to ſome of the moſt learned and judicious Roman-Catholicks here in *England*, this his requeſt was granted: And Archbiſhop *Abbot* ſent for four of the moſt judicious Prieſts that were then to be found here, three Jeſuits, and one Secular Prieſt, and theſe had the liberty of peruſing and examining theſe Regiſters as much as they pleaſed; and after they had fully examined the whole, but eſpecially what related to *Parker*'s Conſecration, they declared before ſeveral Proteſtant Biſhops, then preſent, that theſe Regiſters ſeemed to them to be beyond all exception.

* *Maſon*'s Epiſtle Dedicatory

Maſon's Vind. Lib. 3. c. 18. p. 415.

And here our Author may pleaſe to take notice what the reaſons were why theſe Regiſters were ſhewn to

to these Priests, and why they were shewn no sooner: And if this be not sufficient to prove them authentick, I would fain know what better Evidence or Authority they can give us for any matter of Fact that has been done in their Church, or for any of those Manuscripts or Records which their *Vatican* boasts of. And they that after so full a Testimony as this, can give any credit to so groundless a Fable, as that of the *Nags-head* Consecration, may with as good reason swallow the Story of the forty thousand Pilgrims, or Page 9. any other the like Romance delivered in the Legends of the Romish Church. But I need say no more of this, since, though it deserves not a serious Argument, yet it has been fully handled both by *Mason*, and the learned *Bramhall*, neither of whose Discourses, have as yet, nor are ever like to meet with a just answer.

And thus I have indeavoured to vindicate the Mission or Spiritual Jurisdiction of the established Church, and to shew that her Bishops and Clergy are able to derive this by Succession from Christ and his Apostles, as clearly and fully as those that make the greatest pretentions to it. And having cleared this, which is the main exception against their Authority; I shall dispatch the rest in a few words. And,

Secondly, For the second exception, That they are forced to derive their Mission from Kings and Queens, and to borrow their Jurisdiction from Lay-Authority, this, as it relates to a Spiritual Jurisdiction, falls to the ground of it self; for it being already proved, that this Spiritual Mission is actually derived to these Persons, through Spiritual hands, by a clear and undoubted Succession from Christ and his Apostles; here is no need of calling in a Lay-Authority, or of being forced to borrow this kind of Jurisdiction from Kings or

See the 23 & 37 Article of the Church of *England*.

Queens. And as we have proved that, *de facto*, we have not done this, so we affirm that, *de Jure*, we are not to do it; for Kings and Queens have no power either to exercise this Jurisdiction themselves, or to give it to others; for this depends upon that inward Character which men receive in the act of their Ordination or Consecration to these Spiritual Offices, which Character they cannot receive but from such Persons who are possessed of it themselves, that is, from a Spiritual, not a Lay Authority.

But then here we are to observe, that though this Jurisdiction, as it is Spiritual and Internal, is wholly derived from Spiritual Persons, yet, for what concerns the outward exercise of it, and its obtaining any Civil or Temporal Effects, it must, as to these things, have a dependence upon the Supreme Civil Power: And the reason of this is evident, which is, that both the Persons that exercise this Spiritual Power, and those on whom it is exercised are the Subjects or Dependents of this Civil Power, and being so, they must be accountable to this Power for all such acts as do fall under its cognizance, and all acts, which have a civil effect, that is, which make any change in mens temporal concerns, being such as do primarily relate to, and come under the notice of the Civil Power; therefore even those Persons, who are possessed of this Spiritual Mission or Jurisdiction, must, as to the outward acts or exercise of it, depend upon, and be accountable to, the Supreme Civil Power: Thus, for instance, he who has, by a due Ordination from Spiritual hands, received the Character of a Christian Priest, this man is qualified or inabled hereby to preach the word, and to administer the Sacraments, and to remit or retain sins, and he needs no other Authority besides this, for the making

making these acts valid and sufficient, as to their Spiritual Effects; but then that he should warrantably or legally exercise these acts over such a distinct number or Congregation of Christians, and that the acts should have not only a Spiritual, but also a Civil Effect over the Persons among whom he does exercise them, this, we say, does in a great measure depend upon the Civil Power, and cannot have its intire effect, without the concurrence of this Power.

And this matter is very plain, as to the last branch of the Priestly Power, that of the retaining of sins, the temporal effect of which is, the excluding such Persons, whose sins are retained from the Congregation of Christians, by the Sentence of Excommunication; which Sentence, though, *in foro Conscientiæ*, it has its Spiritual Force or Effect upon the Priests denouncing of it, yet it cannot externally be put in practice, or serve actually to exclude a man from the visible Congregation of Christians, unless it be confirmed and assisted by the Civil Power: And if it should be pretended that this Sentence ought to be looked upon as valid, and to be put in execution in despight of the Civil Power, this would be a plain invasion of the Rights of that Power, and a setting up another in competition with it.

And as the case is thus with respect to the exercise of the Priestly Function, so is it the same as to those acts which are peculiar to the Office of a Bishop: for here also, though the Spiritual Power or Mission be derived from the hands of Spiritual Persons, yet it must, as to the outward acts or exercise of it, depend upon the Supreme Civil Power. And here we may observe,

First, That the Sphere it self, in which these Persons are to act, or that space over which they are to

have an actual Juriſdiction as Biſhops, is allotted or aſſigned to them by the Civil Power; for though the order of Epiſcopacy it ſelf be of Divine, or, at leaſt, of Apoſtolical Inſtitution, yet the appointing every Biſhop his diſtinct or proper Dioceſs to act in, is not ſo; this muſt proceed from Humane Authority, and be limited by the Civil Conſtitutions of thoſe Nations which became Chriſtians. And nothing is more plain in Antiquity, than that Chriſtian Kings and Emperors did erect, or appoint Biſhopricks in their ſeveral Dominions, and did ſet out the diſtinct ſpace or extent of each. And for this Iſland of *Britain* we are plainly told, That *when King* Lucius *had received the Rule of Faith from the Legates of Pope* Eleutherius, *he ordained or appointed twenty eight Archbiſhops and Biſhops, according to the number of the Heathen Flamens and Arch-flamens*, that is, the King allotted every Biſhop his particular Sphere or Dioceſs to act in, and within the ſpace thus allotted to him, he was to exerciſe his Spiritual Power or Juriſdiction.

Rudburnus in Chronico minore. Vide *Uſher*, P. 58.

Secondly, As the number and extent of Dioceſſes was appointed by the Supreme Civil Power; ſo were the particular Perſons, who were to preſide over or officiate in them, nominated by the ſame Power. And that Chriſtian Princes were anciently poſſeſſed of this right of Nominations or Inveſtitures of Biſhops, is made out at large by the learned *Maſon* in his Fourth Book *de Miniſt. Anglic.* And that it was of conſtant uſe in this Nation before the *Norman* Conqueſt, and has, upon that ground, been ſince claimed by the Kings of *England*, will be evident to any that will be at the pains to conſult the Acts of Parliament made in the 35*th* year of King *Edward* I. And in the 25*th* year of King *Edward* III. And it cannot be denied, but the Popes themſelves were, for ſeveral Ages, nominated to, and inveſted in their Biſhopricks

Bishopricks by the Roman Emperours; so that this right also over the actual Jurisdiction of Bishops must be allowed to the Civil Power.

Thirdly, If these two Rites are allowed to the Civil Power, it must follow from hence, that this Power has also a right to declare what particular Persons are duly possessed of these Bishopricks, and may lawfully act, or exercise a Jurisdiction, as such, for if it belongs to this Power, both to limit the Dioceſs, and to nominate the Person who is to act in it, the same Power may surely declare what persons shall be allowed to act as Bishops in these Dioceſses, according to the Laws or Constitutions of that particular State.

Provided always that these persons have received a Spiritual Mission or Consecration to this Office from those who have by Succession derived this Character from Christ and his Apostles. And this is the very case which our Author cites from Dr. *Heylin*, and with which he thinks he has confounded our whole Episcopal Order. We find by the Story, that *Bonner*, refusing the Oath of Supremacy, gives this as one of his Pleas for so doing, that *Horn*, by whose Authority it was tendered to him, was not rightful Bishop of *Winchester*, and the ground of this Allegation was, that he had not been duly consecrated, or made a Bishop by such a Form as was established by the Laws of this Realm. Page 10, 11, 122.

Now the Form by which *Horn* was consecrated, was that which had been made, and confirmed in Parliament in the Reign of King *Edward* VI. and had been repealed in the first year of Queen *Mary*, and was supposed by *Bonner* and his Party, not to have been sufficiently restored to its legal Force or Authority, at the time when *Horn* and the rest were consecrated by it, though the Book to which this Form was annexed,

Entitled,

Entitled, *The Book of Common-Prayer and Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church*, was confirmed and reſtored to its full force and effect in the firſt year of Queen *Elizabeth*, c. 2. This, I ſay, was the Plea, and it was brought into Parliament in the Eighth of Queen *Elizabeth*, to be there diſcuſt and decided. And upon a full hearing of the cauſe, it was determined, That this Form ought to be looked upon as a part of that Book of Common-Prayer, to which it was annexed by Act of Parliament in the Fifth and Sixth of *Edward* VI. and ſo to have been eſtabliſhed with that Book in the firſt of Queen *Elizabeth*. And accordingly all thoſe Archbiſhops and Biſhops, who had been conſecrated by that Form, were declared and enacted to be rightly made, ordered and conſecrated, and were to have Authority or Juriſdiction as ſuch, within their ſeveral Dioceſſes, by the Laws or Conſtitutions of this Realm. Now upon this Act of Parliament, there has been a great cry made heretofore, and is now renewed by this Author, That the Biſhops who were here declared or enacted ſuch, were no more than Parliamentary Biſhops, that is, they were in truth no Biſhops before this Act, but were forced to borrow their whole Authority or Juriſdiction from hence: but that this is a very abſurd and unreaſonable Suggeſtion will appear, If we conſider,

Firſt, That this Act, in what it declares or enacts concerning theſe Archbiſhops and Biſhops, does confine it ſelf to *that Form or Order of Conſecration, which had been made in the Reign of King* Edward VI. *repealed in that of Queen* Mary, *and reſtored with the Book of Common-Prayer in the firſt of Queen* Elizabeth; *and the Perſons who had been ordered or conſecrated by this Form, and no others, are here declared to be rightly made Archbiſhops and*

and Bishops, and authorized to act as such: From whence it plainly appears, That this Parliament did acknowledge that these persons had their Spiritual Authority or Jurisdiction from the use of this Form, and from those Spiritual persons who did use or apply it to them; for otherwise, they needed not to have mentioned this Form at all, or to have taken any notice whether the persons, whom they declared to be Archbishops and Bishops, had received any Consecration from Spiritual hands or not: And if they had done this, and in making this Declaration, had shewed no regard to any preceding Consecration, we confess, the persons so declared, might very justly have been stiled Parliamentary Bishops, and would have had no other ground but this for their Episcopal Jurisdiction, that is, no ground at all for the Internal or Spiritual part of it.

But now when this Form, which we have already proved to be valid in it self, was supposed to have been used, and no other persons were allowed for Bishops, but such as had been consecrated by it, 'tis plain that this Parliament did acknowledge these Bishops to derive the Spiritual part of their Jurisdiction from that Act of Consecration, and so to have had it antecedently to this Declaration of theirs; for which reason these Bishops could not be said to borrow their Character from the Parliament, nor could in any proper sense, be stiled Parliamentary Bishops; which will farther appear if we consider,

Secondly, That this Act was not intended to be operative, but only declarative, that is, The Parliament did not take upon them to make Bishops, or to give them all the Powers by which they were to act, but only to declare what particular persons they conceived and allowed to have been duly made, and so to be qualified

to

to receive and exerciſe that Temporal Authority, or Juriſdiction, which they were to derive from the Supreme Civil Power.

Now this was that, which it was highly proper for them to judge of or determine, for ſince, as we have ſeen but now, it belongs to the Civil Power to beſtow this kind of Juriſdiction on Biſhops, ſince it is proper and peculiar to this power both to appoint or ſet out the Dioceſſes, and alſo to nominate, or elect the perſons, who are to act as Biſhops in them; it muſt alſo belong to the ſame power to judge or declare what perſons it conceives to be duly qualified or ſufficiently endued with that Character, which may inable them to diſcharge theſe ſacred Functions.

And this in truth is a branch of the Royal Prerogative, and that to which the Kings and Queens of this Realm have an undoubted right: And if the Queen were pleaſed to conſult or adviſe with her high Court of Parliament concerning this, and ſo a Law were made by the Supreme Legiſlative power, declaring that ſuch perſons as had been conſecrated by this particular Form, were to be held for good and lawful Biſhops, and that they ſhould be ſupported or maintained as ſuch in the outward exerciſe of their Authority or Juriſdiction, this was but what did properly fall under the cognizance of this Court, and that which they were obliged to declare in defence of their Soveraign's right, from whoſe power alone theſe Biſhops did derive the Civil or Temporal part of their Juriſdiction.

Now then this declaring or enacting by Parliament did not add any thing to the inward Character of theſe Biſhops, for this they had before, and would ſtill have had as compleatly without it; but all the benefit they received from hence was, that it gave, or rather owned,

a power to be in them, to exercise such a Jurisdiction, as should have its full and intire effects by the standing Laws or Constitutions of the Realm: And it could not be absurd or ridiculous (whatever our Author thinks of it) for the Bishops themselves to joyn in this Act, since they did hereby only maintain the validity of that Form by which they had been consecrated, and the just Authority of that Civil power, which had invested them in their Bishopricks. So that, upon the whole matter, it appears, that these Protestant Bishops did not derive their Spiritual Mission or Jurisdiction from the Queen or Parliament, but only that they were acknowledged to have received this Mission, and were confirmed by their Authority in the civil use or exercise of it, as it was meet that they should be, since, as to this part of their Function, they did depend upon, and were accountable to, the supreme civil power. And thus I have done with the second Exception made by this Author against the Mission or Jurisdiction of our Bishops and Clergy, and have shewed that they do not, as he suggests, wholly derive their Mission from Kings or Queens, nor borrow their Jurisdiction from Lay-Authority. I proceed to the Page 15.

Thirdly, Third and last Exception, which is, That these Protestant Bishops cannot pretend to derive their Mission from the Church of *Rome*, since this Church cannot be supposed to send them to preach the Doctrine of the 39 Articles. As to this Exception we have these things to answer,

First, That it supposes that we must necessarily depend upon the Church of *Rome* for our Spiritual Mission, and that if we cannot derive it from hence, it is in vain for us to look for it elsewhere, or to pretend that we can derive it any other way by Succession

from Chriſt and his Apoſtles: but we have ſhewn already that there is no ſuch abſolute neceſſity for this, but that it is highly probable that this Miſſion did not come at firſt to the Biſhops of this Nation by the way of *Rome*, and that the Succeſſion ſeems with more reaſon to be derived either from the Apoſtles St. *Philip* or St. *Paul*, than from *St. Peter*. But

Secondly, Allowing that our Proteſtant Biſhops do derive their Succeſſion and Miſſion from thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, that is, that they were at firſt conſecrated, and did receive the Epiſcopal Character from ſuch as were in Communion with that Church, and did in all reſpects hold the ſame Faith which is profeſſed by it, yet we affirm that theſe Biſhops may ſafely and warrantably preach the Doctrines contained in the 39 Articles. And this we make good upon theſe two reaſons.

First, Becauſe there is nothing contained in theſe Articles, but what is moſt agreeable both to the Scriptures, and the Faith of the primitive Church; and this has been abundantly proved by Biſhop *Jewel*, Archbiſhop *Laud*, Mr. *Chillingworth* and others, who have written in defence of this Church, and her Doctrines, as they are reformed from the Corruptions and Innovations of that of *Rome*. Now if theſe be in themſelves more pure and primitive Doctrines than thoſe which the Church of *Rome* her ſelf teaches, then what ſhould hinder their being taught by vertue of a Miſſion derived from, or beſtowed by, that Church? For if purity of Faith or Doctrine be that which all Churches are in the firſt place to aim at, then a Miſſion derived from any particular Church cannot loſe its force, ſo long as thoſe that have it do apply it to this uſe, ſo long as they do really raiſe or advance the purity of that Faith they teach. But,

Secondly,

Secondly, The other reaſon why thoſe who received their Miſſion from the Church of *Rome* may ſafely preach the Doctrine of the 39 Articles is, becauſe no man, who is ordained by another, is obliged to hold or teach in all Points, the ſame Doctrine with him who ordained him, for the Miſſion or Ordination may be good in it ſelf, and yet he that gives it may hold ſome falſe and erroneous Opinions, and if ſo, he cannot oblige the perſon ordained, to hold the ſame Opinions, by vertue of his receiving this Miſſion or Ordination from him.

And as the caſe is thus with particular perſons, ſo is it alſo with parties or numbers of Chriſtians going under the ſame denomination: We may inſtance in the Sect of the *Donatiſts*, the Biſhops of which Sect our Author allows *to have been true Biſhops as to Ordination*, Page 7. that is, that they both had themſelves, and could give to others a true or proper Miſſion.

Now ſuppoſing a perſon to have been ordained or conſecrated by one of theſe Biſhops, nay, that at the time of his Ordination he had held the ſame Errours which they did, but afterwards, upon better information, he was willing to depoſite his Errours, and return to the Orthodox Faith; we demand, whether it had not been poſſible for this man to have imbraced the truth, and to have retained his Miſſion together with it? Let our Author conſider what anſwer it is proper to give in this caſe, and let him accept of the ſame from us, with reſpect to thoſe Biſhops, who received their Miſſion or Conſecration from thoſe in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, and yet thought themſelves obliged to preach the Doctrine of the 39 Articles. But

Thirdly, And laſtly, We have yet a more full and ſubſtantial anſwer to give in this matter, which is, That the Biſhops and Clergy of every National Church, from what hand ſoever they receive their Miſſion, have by vertue of it a power given them to examine into the Doctrines or Principles of that Religion which they are to teach, and comparing theſe with the Rule of Scripture, and Primitive Tradition, to reform or amend whatſoever ſhall ſeem to them, aſſembled in Synod or Convocation, not to agree or correſpond with this Rule: And what they determine in theſe caſes, when they are lawfully called together, and allowed a full and a free debate, this, we ſay, does oblige all the Members of that particular Church, and does warrant both the Clergy to preach, and the Laity to receive the Doctrines which are thus eſtabliſhed.

We deny not, but whatever is thus determined in National Synods is to be ſubmitted to the Sentence or Judgment of the whole Church, or her true Repreſentatives aſſembled in a General or Oecumenical Council; but till ſuch a one can be called (which we have little hopes to conceive that there ever will) we muſt own this to be the moſt proper and effectual means for reforming thoſe Errors in Faith, and Corruptions in practice, which have crept into, and defiled any particular Church. And this we have often aſſerted, and proved to be a Right or Priviledge belonging to every National Church, ſo long as it proceeds by the aforeſaid Rule, and acts with the Warrant of that Civil Authority which is Supreme, and Independent on any other power on Earth.

And

And this is the very case of the Church of *England*, which being a Church compleat and intire within it self, and never subject, *de Jure*, to any Foreign Power or Jurisdiction, had an undoubted right to reform or amend it self, that is, to assemble her Bishops and Clergy, and to set them upon comparing both the Doctrine and Discipline of the present Church with the rule of Scripture, and the best Antiquity; and this being done with mature advice and deliberation, to reject what was novel or corrupt in either, and to establish what appeared to be sound and ancient, what would bear this Test of Scripture and Antiquity. And thus we affirm that the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of *England* were sent, even by those of the Church of *Rome*, to preach the Doctrine of the 39 Articles, that is, they were authorized by the Mission they received from them to inquire into the nature of the Doctrine which they were to preach, and so, being lawfully assembled in their Synod or Convocation, as they were a compleat National Clergy, to make such a change or Reformation in it, as might advance its Purity, and bring it nearer to the Standard of its first Institution: And in this sense there is no absurdity in saying, that the Church of *Rome* sent the Bishops of the Church of *England* to preach the Doctrine of the Thirty nine Articles.

Vide *Bramhall* Just Vindication of the Church of *England*, c. 5, 6.

And thus we have considered the whole charge or accusation brought, or rather repeated by this Author, against the Bishops and Clergy of the established Church, and have shewed, that even according to the Principles of his own Church, there is nothing wanting towards their being compleatly ordained and consecrated for those Functions or

Offices

Offices which they bear in the Chriſtian Church; that the Forms by which theſe Functions have been conferred on them, are in themſelves very full and ſufficient for the conferring them; that they have received their Miſſion or Spiritual Juriſdiction from the hands of Spiritual Perſons, and ſo do profeſs to derive this by Succeſſion from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, not borrowing it from Kings or Queens, nor acknowledging that it can be given them by any Lay-Authority; but for the Civil or Temporal part of their Juriſdiction, they own this to depend upon, and to be owing to, the Supreme Civil Power, to which power all other Perſons and Powers are to be ſubject, and accountable for the outward acts or exerciſe of this Juriſdiction; that, as to what the Biſhops and Clergy, thus ſent or commiſſioned, do preach or deliver, different from the Doctrines or Opinions of thoſe Biſhops who ſent them, this they are impowered to do by their Miſſion, as they make up a National Clergy, and think it requiſite, for the Purity of the Faith, to make ſuch a change: And they do not hereby forfeit, but fulfil their Spiritual Miſſion.

And theſe things having been ſufficiently proved, and the material Exceptions, as to each of them, anſwered and taken off, we may reaſonably conclude in direct oppoſition to this Author: And whereas he ſays, that *the pretended Biſhops of this Church are no Biſhops at all, or at the beſt they can but pretend to be Biſhops with many doubts on their backs*, we may, on the contrary, aſſert, that they are, both as to their Ordination and Miſſion, true and compleat Biſhops, ſuch concerning whoſe Character and Authority there can be no reaſonable doubt or diſpute, nor in truth, any

Page 18.

any thing objected, which may not with equal force be urged againſt any other Perſons who bear that Character in the Chriſtian World.

And in particular we may very ſafely and truly affirm, That the Biſhops of this Church are not liable to ſo great doubts concerning their Conſecrations; as thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, according to their own Principles, are ſubject to concerning theirs; for they make the validity of Ordination to depend upon the intention of the Ordainer, which is ſuch a condition as no man can be fully aſſured of, but the Ordainer himſelf: And therefore the Perſons thus ordained or conſecrated, *muſt lye under the guilt of* Page 18. *Sacriledge, for adminiſtring the Sacraments, and conferring Orders, this great doubt ſtill remaining uncleared, nor poſſible ever to be ſo*: for if any one in a long Succeſſion did not intend to confer theſe orders when he performed the outward Ceremony, all the Orders derived from hence muſt be invalid, and conſequently involve thoſe in the guilt of Sacriledge, who have preſumed to act by vertue of them. And now let any equal Judge determine whether they that own, and act by this Principle, do not make Biſhops with greater doubts on their backs, than thoſe Perſons have who are conſecrated in the way, and by the Form, preſcribed by the Church of *England*.

Thus far I have followed this Author through every Point that is material in his Pamphlet: As to the Scandals of Luſt, Rapine, and Sacriledge, which he takes care to repeat in the cloſe, I have ſaid enough concerning theſe to ſatisfie any ingenuous Reader, and I ſhall not anſwer him here in his own way (though I might eaſily do it) but leave him to be anſwered in this reſpect, as he deſerves, *viz.* not as an Author, but as a Libeller.

F I N I S.

Some Books lately Printed for *Brab. Aylmer.*

A Treatise of the Popes Supremacy; to which is added, A Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church. By Dr. *Isaac Barrow.*

A Discourse against Transubstantiation. By Dr. *Tillotson.*

A Discourse concerning the Adoration of the Host, as it is Taught and Practised in the Church of *Rome.*

A Discourse of the Communion in One Kind: In Answer to a Treatise of the Bishop of *Meaux's.*

A Discourse of the Sacrifice of the Mass, Quarto.

A Discourse against Purgatory.

A Request to Roman Catholicks to Answer the Queries upon these their following Tenets, (*viz.*)

Sect. I. Their Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue, II. Their taking away the Cup from the People. III. Their with-holding the Scriptures from the Laicks. IV. The Adoration of Images. V. The Invocation of Saints and Angels. VI. The Doctrine of Merit. VII. Purgatory. VIII. Their Seven Sacraments. IX. Their Priests Intention in Baptism. X. The Limbo of unbaptized Infants. XI. Transubstantiation. XII. The Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass. XIII. Private Masses. XIV. The Sacrament of Penance. XV. The Sacrament of Marriage, with the Clergies Restraint therefrom. XVI. Their Sacrament of Extream Unction. XVII. Tradition. XVIII. That thread-bare Question, Where was your Church before *Luther*? XIX. The Infallibility of the Pope with his Councils. XX. The Pope's Supremacy. XXI. The Pope's Deposing Power. XXII. Their Uncharitableness to all other Christians.

A New Version of the Psalms of *David*, together with all the Church-Hymns, into Metre, Smooth, Plain and Easie to the most ordinary Capacities: And yet as close to the Original Languages, and the last and best English Translation, as the Nature of such a Work will well permit. By *Simon Ford*, D. D. and Rector of *Old Swinford* in *Worcestershire.*

A Preparation for the Lords-Supper. To which are added, Maxims of True Christianity. Written Originally in *French* by *P. Allix.* late Minister of *Charrenton* in *France*, now of *London*, Octavo.